

both internal and international policy, internal and international Communists, and internal and international anti-Communists. The attack is both from within and without. The counterattack must be the same.

This is why State committees are important. This is why we should have more of them. This is why I urge all of you to support the creation of such a committee here in Alabama. It is also why the national defense strategy seminars, which have pointed out the interrelationship of the U.S. Communist Party with Communist forces abroad, are so important. It is why they are needed. It is why the attack on them must be fought and their continuation assured.

The orders have come from Moscow for our native traitorous Reds to destroy you and me, the Legion, the committee, and every other American truly dedicated to freedom—

and who therefore is, by that very fact, a vigorous, hard-hitting anti-Communist. The Kremlin has challenged us. It has thrown down its gantlet before us.

As a member of the American Legion, as a Member of the Congress, and as a fellow American citizen, I call on you to respond to this challenge in the American way—by accepting it without hesitation, calmly, with confidence and determination: I urge you to renew and to intensify the American Legion's fight against communism, to go all-out in your defense and support of other anti-Communists—whether group or individual, governmental or private—and I urge you to refuse to back down from this challenge until the Communists, and not we, are the vanquished.

Make no mistake about it, it is our necks or theirs. Moscow means what it says—and so does its U.S. agents. They will get

you—unless you get them. They will get all anti-Communists, unless the anti-Communists band together and launch a well-planned, concerted counteroffensive and carry it out to a successful conclusion. They will also get the United States as a Nation, and then all of us—or at least those of us who are still living—will be their slave laborers, if we don't stop them first.

This is the reality we face. These are the true issues. I am confident that you will face up to them, that you will not seek refuge in the kind of escapism that characterizes too many opinion makers and could be fatal not only to our country, but to civilization itself.

Rather, as Americans and as veterans of other wars your country has fought, you will not only accept this challenge, but you will also accept only one solution to it—victory, the defeat of those who would destroy us.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 1, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH, a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, the fountain of all wisdom and goodness, we thank Thee for the gift of sleep when the tangled web of weary strife and of perplexed thought emerges clarified and straightened by the magic touch of a new day.

In the midst of daily toil and everpressing tasks we lay before Thee the inner meditations of our hearts, grateful for the noontide pause at this wayside altar of peace and prayer.

Bring all our desires and powers, we beseech Thee, into conformity with Thy will. Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day with its vast issues that concern not only our own dear land, but all the continents and islands of the sea. May our individual lives be as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom of a world that lieth in darkness.

We ask it in the name of that One who is the Light of the World. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C. August 1, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. BUSH thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 31, 1961, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2197) to amend section 107(a)(3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. THOMAS, Mr. YATES, Mr. CANNON, Mr. OSTERTAG, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 44) to authorize the appropriation of \$150,000 for use toward the construction of a U.S. Pacific war memorial, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 6345. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6611. An act to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months, and for other purposes.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 44) to authorize the appropriation of \$150,000 for use toward the construction of a U.S. Pacific war

memorial, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

### LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

J. Carter Wright, and sundry other candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

A. Everette MacIntyre, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner;

Lawrence J. O'Connor, Jr., of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission; Rear Adm. John Harlee, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board;

Voit Gilmore, of North Carolina, to be the Director of the U.S. Travel Service;

Capt. Theodore J. Fabik, and Capt. Oscar C. Rohnke, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard; and

James B. Allen, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointments in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

### U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jonathan W. Daniels, of North Carolina, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### AMBASSADOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### PERMISSION FOR DISTRIBUTING OFFICERS OF AN ARMED FORCE TO ENTRUST FUNDS TO OTHER OFFICERS OF AN ARMED FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit disbursing officers of an armed force to entrust funds to other officers of an armed force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT, AS AMENDED

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY TO ACQUIRE AND CONSTRUCT CERTAIN FACILITIES, PROPERTY, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY

A letter from the Administrator, National Capital Transportation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the National Capital Transportation Agency to carry out part 1 of said Agency's transit development program involving acquisition and incidental construction of facilities, property and rights-of-way for certain future express transit lines in conjunction with the development of major highways and parkways in the National Capital region, and to fur-

ther the objectives of the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of September 2, 1958, establishing a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedures, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 8

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation imposing tariff regulations upon the importation of clay products

"Whereas Ohio has always been known for the large volume and excellence of her clay products, and in many branches of the clay products industry she has been the leader both in volume and in quality among the several States of the United States; and

"Whereas in the manufacture of dinnerware, Ohio led all States up to the year 1953; and

"Whereas due to the competition from the importation of low-priced dinnerware from low-wage foreign countries, which dinnerware is sold in the United States at prices far below costs of manufacture in Ohio, seven Ohio potteries have been forced out of business through bankruptcy or voluntary liquidation; and

"Whereas due to the dissolution of these potteries, thousands of skilled Ohio citizens, both men and women, have lost their means of livelihood, many of whom have not been able to find other employment, and therefore add to the growing unemployment problems of the State and the Nation; and

"Whereas if the remaining six potteries, which are operating far below their total capacity and employment levels of 1952, are to be saved from a similar fate that fell upon the other members of the industry, it will be necessary for Congress to afford relief from the flood of low-wage, foreign-made ware: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the 104th General Assembly of Ohio hereby respectfully memorializes Congress to legislate tariff regulations for the importation of clay products providing quotas based upon the average importations for the last 10 years from each foreign country; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the pages of the journal, and that the clerk of the house of representatives transmit properly authenticated copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the two U.S. Senators from Ohio, and to each Member of the House of Representatives in Congress from Ohio.

"ROGER CLOUD,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"JOHN W. DONAHAY,

"President of the Senate.

"Adopted June 14, 1961."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

#### "HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

"Whereas millions of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict have been educated under the provisions of the veterans' education program established by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas many veterans were able to obtain further education through the benefits of the veterans' education program which would not have been possible otherwise; and

"Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the level of education of this country and has produced a major national asset in better and more skilled manpower and has done much to improve the economy of our country; and

"Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans resulting from higher education and improved skills will more than reimburse the National Treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, by Executive order of January 31, 1955, stopped the educational benefits for persons inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States after February 1, 1955; and

"Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational benefits that were granted to veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

"Whereas the veteran education program has been an integral factor in strengthening the defense system of our country and the continuation of this program may be justified in terms of our educational ideas and needs; and

"Whereas it has been established by reliable statistics that the investment in education for our own American youth will be more than repaid to the Public Treasury through increased taxes, resulting from higher incomes earned by such veterans: Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That the General Assembly of the State of Illinois does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend GI education benefits to all veterans who have entered or who will enter military service on or after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended as long as the provision of the draft law shall exist; and that a copy of this resolution be mailed by the clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Illinois.

"Adopted by the house, April 12, 1961.

"PAUL POWELL,

"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"GLEN F. TERRINE,

"Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Concurred in by the senate, June 30, 1961.

"SAMUEL H. SHEPHERD,

"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD E. FERNANDES,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works:

#### "HOUSE RESOLUTION 144

"Whereas the southern area of the State of Illinois is rich in minerals and other natural resources, having over 13 billion tons of unmined coal alone in the Saline River Valley; and

"Whereas many large industries have indicated a willingness to locate industrial



plants in said area, adjacent to the coalfields and other sources of raw materials, provided that water transportation is made available; and

"Whereas southern Illinois has a large amount of unemployment; and

"Whereas from preliminary surveys that have been made, it appears that it is desirable and feasible to canalize the Saline River and the Middle Fork from the Ohio River to Harrisburg which would provide an economical outlet for coal, farm products, fluorspar, oil and manufactured products, thus benefiting the southern area of Illinois as well as the economic welfare of the entire State and Nation: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to provide funds and to authorize and direct the Army Corps of Engineers to make a full and complete investigation of the possibilities of such canalization and that sufficient funds be made available so that said project can be completed as soon as possible, and that suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate and all Representatives of Congress in the State of Illinois.

"Adopted by the house June 28, 1961.

"PAUL POWELL,

"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"CHAS. T. KERVIN,

"Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the American Committee of California for Freedom of Enslaved Nations, at Los Angeles, Calif., pledging its full support and loyalty toward the Government of the United States, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### RESOLUTION OF TEXAS SENATE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Senate of the State of Texas recently adopted a resolution concerning the admonishment of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker. In this resolution, the Texas Senate goes on record giving its support to the reinstatement of General Walker as commander of the 24th Infantry Division.

The resolution raises questions reflecting on the judgment of the administration in this instance. It relates to the issue of censorship of military leaders which has been discussed in this body during the past few days by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and others.

In my opinion these questions should not go unanswered. The American people have a right to be informed.

I ask unanimous consent to place the resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 516

Whereas Maj. Gen. E. A. (Ted) Walker, former commander of the 24th Infantry Division in Germany, is a native of Center Point, Kerr County, Tex., where his mother and brother still reside; and

Whereas General Walker has had a brilliant Army career and is a graduate of West

Point and commanded the 2d Division Artillery at Heartbreak Ridge in the Korean war where this division fired a record of 22,000 rounds every 24 hours for 14 consecutive days, and General Walker was also in Anzio and Casino operations of World War II; and

Whereas General Walker has proved his undying and unshakeable loyalty to his beloved United States of America and has always conducted himself as a true, loyal American; and

Whereas the Defense Department in Washington has relieved him of his command because of charges brought by the owners of the Overseas Weekly, a Delaware corporation, which publication has been accused of anti-American leanings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Texas go on record as giving its unqualified support to the reinstatement of General Walker as commander of the 24th Infantry Division in Germany and that the Defense Department in Washington make known the results of its investigation of General Walker and so reinstate him.

BEN RAMSEY,

President of the Senate.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,

Secretary of the Senate.

#### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 7851. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 653).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 2352. A bill to extend for 3 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas, and to provide for the application of such laws to American Samoa; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 2353. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2354. For the relief of Morison Tung Sun Ku; and

S. 2355. A bill for the relief of Filomena F. Schenkenberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2356. A bill to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940; and

S. 2357. A bill to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2358. A bill to improve the administration of transfers of certain real property for wildlife or other purposes by repealing the act of May 19, 1948, and incorporating the essential provisions thereof in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 2359. A bill relating to price support on flue-cured tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 2360. A bill for the relief of Thick Kee Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. SCHOEFFEL):

S. 2361. A bill to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may, if it finds that the national security would not be endangered, issue licenses for the operation of an amateur station to certain aliens for any temporary period, not in excess of 3 years; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### ACQUISITION OF THE GRAFF HOUSE SITE FOR INCLUSION IN INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the site of the Jacob Graff House in Philadelphia for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park.

The Graff House is the house in which Thomas Jefferson wrote the original draft of the Declaration of Independence. This means it is as unique to our history as Independence Hall itself.

The site of this house is now occupied by a hotdog stand. I hardly need labor further this appalling illustration of how history has fallen before commercialization.

Because a man named Thomas C. Donaldson had the wisdom, 78 years ago, to haul parts of the house—then being dismantled to make way for a bank—to his own yard, we have some remnants of the original building and its contents, including a letter by Jefferson himself.

We can envision Jefferson and his colleagues working on the great manifesto of liberty in this house.

In that parlor—

He said in later years—

I wrote habitually and in it wrote this paper particularly.

He worked in two furnished rooms on the second floor—at a rental of 35 shillings a week—from June 10 to 28, 1776. He was a member of a five-man committee, of which two others were John Adams and Benjamin Franklin.

Adams and Jefferson met in subcommittee, and Adams prevailed upon Jefferson to write the original draft—because, as Adams put it, a Virginian ought to be “at the head of this business,” and “because you can write 10 times better than I can.”

A committee of public-spirited Philadelphians has been formed which will raise the funds to rebuild the house. They propose to dedicate it as a Library of Documents of Freedom, a purpose which seems to me in perfect keeping with the exalted spirit of Jefferson, a spirit which continues to nourish the aspirations and dreams of newly independent and freedom-loving people everywhere.

The Declaration of Independence is still a revolutionary statement of unparalleled strength and dignity. It is the charter of our continuing American Revolution, which still mirrors the spirit of our people in their struggle against the totalitarian tyranny of communism. The Declaration has lost none of its pertinence to the problems of today, when all over the world men are seeking to throw off the yoke of tyranny.

Americans could not do better than to remind themselves every day of these sublime words:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.

That remains the best statement of our present, past, and future national purpose that has ever been made.

I hope that the Congress will move quickly to consider and approve this bill to acquire the site of the Jacob Graff House, so that all who visit Independence National Historical Park may reflect on the meaning of those words and the history of which they are a unique part.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2353) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. SCOTT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### IMPROVEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSFERS OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to improve the administration of transfers of certain real property for wildlife or other purposes by repealing the act of May 19, 1948, and incorporating the essential provisions thereof in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, requesting the proposed legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and ap-

propriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2358) to improve the administration of transfers of certain real property for wildlife or other purposes by repealing the act of May 19, 1948, and incorporating the essential provisions thereof in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1961.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft bill prepared by General Services Administration to improve the administration of transfers of certain real property for wildlife or other purposes by repealing the act of May 19, 1948, and incorporating the essential provisions thereof in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1961.

The act of May 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 240, ch. 310), hereinafter referred to as Public Law 537, authorizes the transfer of real property, which is under the jurisdiction or control of a Federal agency and no longer required by such agency, to States, without reimbursement, for the conservation of wildlife other than migratory birds, and to the Department of the Interior, without transfer of funds, for carrying out the national migratory bird management program, provided that such property can be utilized for wildlife conservation purposes; that it is chiefly valuable for such purposes; and that it is available for transfer. Such transfers to other than the United States are subject to the reservation by the United States of all oil, gas, and mineral rights; and, in the event the property is no longer used for the purpose intended or is needed for national defense purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

The primary reason for the proposal to repeal Public Law 537 and incorporate its essential provisions in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is to bring the utilization and disposal of property for wildlife purposes under the general authority of the latter act. Such consolidation will permit the application of appropriate concomitant authority in the latter act, as well as the application of general agency regulations issued thereunder to wildlife property transfers. The result will be a more simplified, economical and efficient operation for this particular category of excess and surplus real property.

Public Law 537 requires clarification in many other respects, as indicated below:

1. The act does not specify who is to determine that a property can be utilized for wildlife conservation purposes. It is proposed that the Secretary of the Interior make this determination inasmuch as the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is aware of the requirements in this area and has working relationships with the State agencies exercising administration over wildlife resources.

2. The act does not specify who is to determine that a property is chiefly valuable for wildlife purposes. The Administrator of General Services, as the Government official

charged with the responsibility and authority for utilization and disposal of surplus real property of all classifications, is best qualified to determine the chief value of property for any particular purpose, including use for wildlife purposes.

Public Law 537 requires a determination by the Administrator of General Services (as successor to the War Assets Administrator) that the property is “available” for use for wildlife purposes. Such determination is not necessary since property no longer required by a Federal agency having jurisdiction or control of that property is first screened as excess property by GSA and is available to the Department of the Interior in accordance with section 2 of the enclosed draft bill; it becomes surplus property if there is no requirement for it by the Department of the Interior or another Federal agency and is then available to a State agency for wildlife conservation purposes, in accordance with section 3(b) of the enclosed draft bill, and other purposes at the time disposal action is taken.

Section 2 of the enclosed draft bill would amend section 202 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize a transfer, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, to the Secretary of the Interior of excess property which the Secretary determines is useful for the purpose of wildlife conservation and has particular value for the purpose of carrying out the national migratory bird management program if the Administrator of General Services, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, determines that the land has chief value for the latter purpose. If the Administrator determines that the land is chiefly valuable for transfer for other purposes, as excess, to another executive agency under other subsections of section 202 of the 1949 act, it would be the Administrator's prerogative to make such a transfer.

Subsection 3(b) of the proposed draft bill would amend section 203 of the 1949 act to permit State agencies to obtain real property for wildlife purposes under the conditions set forth therein once the property became surplus. The latter part of subsection 3(b) of the bill (subsec. (2) of proposed section 203(p) of the 1949 Act) includes all of the reservations and conditions appearing in Public Law 537, together with appropriate amendments and additions thereto which permit a greater safeguard of the interests of the United States. For example, it is believed advisable to reserve to the United States oil, gas and mineral rights in the transferred realty only when the Administrator of General Services determines that such reservations are in the interest of the Government. Such reservations should not be carried on Government records as assets when, in fact, their productive potential is negligible.

Once disposal action has been taken by GSA, it is essential that the reservations or restrictions imposed on the transferee be policed to enforce compliance therewith. Public Law 537 is silent on who would accomplish this. Since the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, for the reasons stated above, has the primary continuing interest in such wildlife property, the enclosed draft bill would amend paragraph (C) of subsection 203(k)(2) of the 1949 act to require that the Secretary of the Interior enforce compliance with, as well as reform, correct or amend and grant releases from the terms, conditions, reservations and restrictions contained in such transfers.

With the incorporation of the substantive provisions of Public Law 537 into the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, efficient administration thereof requires that the publication requirements of section 3 of Public Law 537 be dispensed with and that the reporting re-



quirements of section 3 of Public Law 537 be superseded by the GSA reporting requirements for all surplus property disposals.

The enactment of this legislation would not increase the expenditure of Federal funds.

For these reasons, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

There is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,  
Acting Administrator.

#### PRICE SUPPORT FOR FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to price support on Flue-cured tobacco. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2359) relating to price support on Flue-cured tobacco, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON is as follows:

#### STATEMENT OF SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON

This bill provides that beginning with the 1962 crop, whenever price support is made available for Flue-cured tobacco, the price of Flue-cured tobacco in untied form shall be supported in all Flue-cured tobacco belts. For 1961 and prior years, price support on Flue-cured tobacco in loose form has only been provided in Georgia and Florida. Historically, tobacco, was marketed in loose form only in Georgia and Florida. However, in recent years increasing amounts of tobacco from other areas are being marketed in this form, but in order to obtain price support, must be transported to the auction markets in Georgia and Florida. This has resulted in inconvenience and unnecessary work and expense to these tobacco growers.

The Department of Agriculture gave serious consideration to extending price support on untied Flue-cured tobacco for 1961 on auction markets outside Georgia and Florida, but decided that a further study should be made of the problem. I am informed that this study is now being made. It is realized that action on the bill can probably not be taken immediately and it is hoped that as a result of the study being undertaken by the Department, price support on untied Flue-cured tobacco, will be made available on all auction markets for the 1962 crop by administrative action.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 303 AND 310 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may, if it finds that the national security would not be endangered, issue licenses for the operation of an amateur station to certain aliens for any tempo-

rary period, not in excess of 3 years. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2361) to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may, if it finds that the national security would not be endangered, issue licenses for the operation of an amateur station to certain aliens for any temporary period, not in excess of 3 years, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. SCHOEPPEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. GOLDWATER is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

A serious problem has arisen in the field of amateur radio operation. The United States will not allow aliens of friendly foreign nations, except for Canada, to use their amateur radio equipment while they are in the United States without a permit and the FCC is precluded from issuing such a permit because of the terms of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 as amended. As a consequence of this situation, Mexico recently withdrew from American citizens the privilege of using their amateur radio equipment while in Mexico. This lack of reciprocal good will between Mexico and the United States is magnified when we consider that there are now only a very few countries which will still allow U.S. amateurs to operate in these foreign lands because we will not allow their own citizens to operate their equipment while in this country. This situation affects not only the amateur operators, but servicemen and others overseas who would like to take advantage of amateur radio links between several countries so they might talk to loved ones in this country.

This amendment to the act would therefore allow for aliens of friendly nations to operate with their own equipment while in this country, provided that their country offers this same reciprocal courtesy to U.S. citizens. The passage of this amendment would do much to foster more good will with friendly foreign nations and at the same time protect our national security as there are provisions in the bill covering this important area.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 1, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 120) to authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months, and for other purposes.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Article entitled "Senator Offers To Share Alaska's Eagles With Other States," written by Senator GRUENING and published in the July-August 1961 Audubon magazine.

#### ARE AMERICANS TO TIGHTEN THEIR BELTS?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on every hand, these days, we hear pleas to tighten our belts, to be more fit physically, to be alert mentally, in the face of the world crisis. Do we really mean this, or is it just lip service to an ideal? Are we willing to make the sacrifices; or do we want to have our cake and eat it, too?

The Berlin crisis brought us sharply to the realization that America cannot continue to live a hedonistic life and compete successfully with the dedicated people of Russia. We have learned from American visitors abroad that in the area of youth fitness alone, we have fallen pathetically behind other nations. The same attitude, that candy, bubblegum, and soda pop come first, that it is a good thing for children to date when they are 12 and 13 years old, that we should teach "sandpile" and social dancing, to the exclusion of adequate language and science courses, has put us behind in the education race.

Even our President, who in his inaugural speech called for sacrifices and "what you can do for your country," has put no teeth in that statement. In his recent talk in which he outlined the grave international crisis and said that more money was needed for defense, he made no mention of dropping some of the sugar-coated, give-away domestic programs that are costing billions of dollars.

A recent editorial in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, dramatizes the situation that confronts America. This brilliant editorial, which has a clever twist, tells us forcefully where we stand in relation to the facts of life. Are we willing to face up to these facts?

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TALE OF TWO NATIONS

Once there was a country whose people decided to live it up.

They bought goods in great abundance. Workers switched from bicycles to automobiles. In 5 years' time, the number of television sets, washing machines, and other such hard goods doubled. Rich eating, partying, and playing became a national habit.

During the same period, workers' paychecks almost doubled, although workers did not produce a great deal more. And constantly, labor leaders demanded higher and higher wages.

It was a prosperous, outwardly happy time. Politicians assured the people "You never had it so good," and they were right.

But a few sober-minded observers saw the handwriting on the wall. They knew that their people were spending too much, working too little, producing too little, and living too well for their own good. They knew that a nation couldn't continue that pattern very long without serious trouble.

They, too, were right. From a surplus, the country's international balance of payments changed to a deficit. Gold reserves

started to drain away. The country's money became worth less and less. Oversea markets were being lost, and foreign firms were even underselling the country's own products at home.

Does this sound familiar? It should. It describes almost exactly the situation of the United States today.

In fact, however, the country in the story is not the United States, but Britain, which has also gone through a decade of swollen prosperity and now must face the consequences.

Britain's response to its growing economic problems was laid out yesterday before the House of Commons. It includes:

An immediate 10-percent boost in excise and customs taxes on cigarettes, beer, and liquor, automobiles, home appliances, and all luxury goods.

A tough hold-the-line policy on wages and salaries.

A new capital gains tax to discourage stock and real estate speculation.

Tighter control on homebuilding loans and construction.

An increase in the bank rate from 5 to 7 percent, to keep funds in the country.

A 20-percent reduction in foreign spending, a 10-percent cut in spending for diplomatic services abroad, and a hold-the-line policy on aid to underdeveloped nations.

This is a tough line. It will cause some squeals of indignation and pain. It could result in the overthrow of the Conservative government. However it turns out, the program will be a stern test of Britain's moral fiber.

But however it turns out for Britain, one can hardly avoid noting the comparison that while Britain's Government asks its people to take this course, America's Government is asking for more and more spending, domestic and civilian as well as military, and more and more Government paternalism.

It doesn't take a doctorate in political science or economics to tell which is the wiser, more responsible course to cure what is essentially the same problem in both countries.

#### REPORT OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit a report on the meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group which was held at Washington on June 8 and 9. The report includes the financial report. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

(Report to the Senate on the fifth meeting, held at Washington, D.C., June 8-9, 1961, by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, chairman of the Senate delegation)

#### BACKGROUND

The special relationship between Canada and the United States, which has rightly been cited as a model of cooperation between two countries, has been strengthened by meetings of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

Legislative and executive officials in both countries have appreciated the importance of such meetings for the purpose of clarifying misunderstandings which unavoidably arise between neighbors. It was because of this realization that the organization came into existence and held its first meeting on January 9 and 10, 1959. At this time, the

general principles upon which the Group has operated were agreed to.<sup>1</sup>

Public Law 86-42 of June 11, 1959, authorized continuing U.S. participation in the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, provided procedural guidelines, and authorized the appropriation of funds for the expenses of the U.S. delegations to such meetings.

The second meeting of the Group was held in Montreal and Ottawa on June 22-28, 1959, in connection with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The third meeting was held in Washington on April 21-22, 1960. The fourth meeting was held in Ottawa and Quebec City on February 22-26, 1961. At all three meetings, the discussions concerned defense, economic, and boundary matters.

#### COMPOSITION OF DELEGATIONS FOR THE FIFTH MEETING

The Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-42, named the following Members of the Senate for the June 1961 sessions in Washington, D.C.: Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN (Vermont), chairman; Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (Wisconsin); Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON (Washington); Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART (Indiana); Senator HENRY DWORSHAK (Idaho); Senator FRANCIS CASE (South Dakota); Senator MIKE MANSFIELD (Montana); Senator GORDON ALLOTT (Colorado); Senator THOMAS J. DODD (Connecticut); Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY (Minnesota); Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER (Oregon); and Senator CLABORNE PELL (Rhode Island). Senator LEE METCALF (Montana) was later added to the delegation to replace Senator MANSFIELD.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives named the following Members of the House of Representatives: Representative CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER (New Jersey), chairman; Representative EDNA F. KELLY (New York); Representative WILLIAM T. MURPHY (Illinois); Representative FRANK IKARD (Texas); Representative PHILIP J. DULSKI (New York); Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON (New York); Representative WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD (Michigan); Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM (Nebraska); Representative HOWARD W. ROBINSON (New York); and Representative STANLEY R. TUPPER (Maine).

The Canadian delegation was composed of the following from the Senate: Speaker Mark R. Drouin (chairman), Senator W. R. Brunt, Senator Arthur L. Beaubien, Senator Sydney J. Smith, Senator J. E. Lefrancois, and Senator Lionel Choquette. Those from the House of Commons were: Speaker Roland Michener, Mr. Paul Hellyer, Mr. Egan Chambers, Mr. Paul Martineau, Mr. J. M. Forgie, Mr. Gordon H. Aiken, Mr. C. A. Best, Mr. R. C. Coates, Mr. Frank Howard, Mr. Orville H. Phillips, Mr. J. R. Taylor, Mr. O. J. Godin, Mr. C. R. Granger, Mr. H. P. Lessard, Mr. Lucien Grenier, Mr. Harris G. Rogers, Mr. R. R. Southam, and Mr. G. M. Stearns.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING

The fifth meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group took place in Washington, D.C., on June 8 and 9, 1961, after which the delegations spent the weekend of June 10 and 11 visiting defense installations in the Norfolk area.

There were two plenary sessions, one held at the beginning, and the other at the end of the conference. Secretary of State Rusk addressed the first plenary session and wel-

comed the Canadian delegation to Washington. After the first plenary session the delegates separated into two working committees for two sets of meetings each. The Defense and Foreign Policy Committee was presided over on Thursday by Senator Capehart and on Friday by Senator Aiken, with Speaker Drouin, of Canada, as cochairman both days. The Economic Matters Committee was presided over by Representative Gallagher with Speaker Michener as cochairman. The former committee discussed Western Hemisphere cooperation, the strengthening of NATO, China policy, disarmament, and defense production sharing. The latter committee concerned itself with aid to underdeveloped countries, the relationship between the economies of the United States and Canada, boundary waters resources development, and cultural relations.

After the Committee sessions on Thursday morning, the delegates proceeded to the Senate floor where I had the pleasure of introducing the Canadian members. Many Senators contributed welcoming remarks.

On Thursday afternoon the delegates proceeded to the White House where they met with President Kennedy, who wished them every success in their efforts to maintain close, friendly relations. Immediately following the interview, parts of the two delegations were present at the National Zoological Park where they witnessed the presentation by the Canadian Ambassador, Hon. A. D. P. Heeney, of two beavers to the United States.

On Friday morning the Canadian and United States delegates again attended sessions of the two Committees. Immediately after this, the final plenary session was held and the final reports of the Committees were presented. The group adopted these reports as the agreed record of the discussions. The final business of the conference was an authorization to Speakers Drouin and Michener, and Representative Gallagher and myself to issue a joint press statement which summarized the results of the conference. This was done at a press conference by the four chairmen on Friday afternoon.

After the press conference most of the Canadian and some of the U.S. delegation went to the Norfolk, Va., area to receive briefings and inspect defense installations. Those participating in this tour were Senator Drouin, Senator Brunt, Senator Beaubien, Senator Smith, Senator Lefrancois, Senator Choquette, Mr. Hellyer, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Martineau, Mr. Forgie, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Best, Mr. Coates, Mr. Howard, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Godin, Mr. Granger, Mr. Lessard, Mr. Grenier, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Southam, and Mr. Stearns of the Canadian group; and Senator Pell, Representative Gallagher, Representative Murphy, Representative Dulski, and Representative Tupper of the U.S. group.

The delegates were the guests of the U.S. Continental Army Command at Fort Monroe where they were briefed on operations. They also attended military demonstrations at Fort Eustis and Fort Storey and received briefings on space projects at the National Aeronautical and Space Agency at Langley Air Force Base.

#### RESULTS OF THE MEETING

It was once again proved that frank and friendly discussions between the delegations of Canadian and U.S. legislators do promote understanding of bilateral problems and of common external dangers facing the two countries. Even though a relatively short period of time had elapsed since the fourth meeting of the group, the discussions were stimulating and fruitful.

Planning for future meetings should take into account two factors which, experience shows, are most important. Meetings are less productive when held during the busiest portion of sessions of the Congress and the

<sup>1</sup> The history of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group is given in more detail in my report to the Senate of July 31, 1959, and in the report on the Group dated January 17, 1961, prepared for the Committee on Foreign Affairs by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.



Parliament of Canada. Delegates find it hard to get away from their heavy responsibilities. On the other hand, if meetings were scheduled when legislatures are not in session, attendance would be even more difficult and the advantage of seeing each other's governmental processes would be lost. Winter or early spring meetings, then, when legislative pressure in both capitals is lighter, would seem desirable.

I shall mention the other factor only in its application to the U.S. side. Delegates should be appointed well in advance of the meeting dates. Appointment at the last minute means broken engagements and commitments, too little time for preparation and study, and disappointment to Canadian colleagues when American attendance is not 100 percent.

#### JOINT PRESS STATEMENT

The Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group concluded 2 days of discussion in Washington today. Twenty-four Members of the Congress of the United States and 24 Members of the Parliament of Canada, representing all political parties, participated in the discussions.

This was the fifth meeting of the group which held its first and organizational meeting in Washington in January 1959. Since that time, meetings have been held alternately in Canada and the United States. The fourth session was held in Ottawa in February of this year.

The Canadian delegates were welcomed at the opening plenary session by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who underlined the importance of these meetings of legislators of both countries as a valuable means of promoting better understanding and appreciation of their mutual problems. Later in the day the Canadian delegates were received by President Kennedy at the White House.

Committee meetings were held on both days. One committee under the cochairmanship of Senator Mark Drouin, Speaker of the Canadian Senate, and Senator Homer Capehart and later Senator George Aiken, U.S. Senate, discussed defense and foreign policy matters of mutual interest. The other committee under the cochairmanship of Representative Cornelius Gallagher, U.S. House of Representatives, and Roland Michener, Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons, discussed economic questions of concern to both countries.

At the final plenary session today reports of the two committees were discussed and approved.

Members of both delegations were scheduled to leave Washington late Friday afternoon for Norfolk, Va., where they will be the guests of the Continental Army Command on Saturday and will attend air and ground exercises taking place at Fort Storey and Fort Eustis. The group is also expected to visit the National Space Agency. On the same day the wives of the delegates will visit Jamestown and Williamsburg. Both delegations will return to their respective capitals on Sunday afternoon.

There follows the agreed summary reports of the two committees:

#### Report of Defense and Foreign Policy Committee

##### 1. Western Hemisphere Cooperation

(a) Canadian participation in the OAS: U.S. members supported President Kennedy's recent suggestion that Canada consider joining the OAS. Canadian members agreed that Canada and the United States must stand together in supporting common objectives within the hemisphere, to raise standards of living and help meet the Communist threat. The problem for Canada is to decide whether joining the OAS would be in the best interest of Canada and the Western Hemisphere. This question is the

subject of lively public discussion in Canada at the present time.

Among the arguments advanced in favor of Canada's association with the OAS were the assistance which Canada might be able to give toward raising living standards in Latin America, the additional weight of Canadian leadership and stability in hemispheric policy discussions, removal of the anomaly of Canadian participation in NATO but not in OAS, and removal of doubt about Canada's support of the principles on which OAS is founded.

Among the arguments mentioned in opposition to Canadian participation in OAS were the limitations on Canada's resources, the risk that Canada's position in OAS would either be labeled as that of a satellite of the United States or would be harmful to U.S. prestige to the extent that Canada's attitudes diverged from that of the United States on significant issues, and finally the loss of Canada's ability to present an uncommitted view on problems arising in the hemisphere.

(b) Cuba: There was complete agreement on the serious threat which Communist influence in Cuba presents to the whole hemisphere. With respect to methods of countering this danger, however, there were two basically different approaches. Some felt that the situation warranted drastic measures. Others believed the Cuban revolution was brought about by underlying causes which are to be found in many other areas in Latin America. These unhealthy tendencies must be dealt with on a long-term basis through programs of economic assistance, information, cultural interchange, and foreign policies in the interest of the freedom and economic opportunity of mankind.

The committee agreed that there is need for expressing to the peoples of less developed countries the social objectives of our society. To compete successfully with the Communists in the emerging countries we must explain our system in terms of social justice as well as personal freedom.

##### 2. Strengthening NATO

There was full agreement on the necessity of strengthening the conventional forces assigned to NATO. It was noted that both Canada and the United States have met their NATO force goals. Several specific NATO defense problems were discussed: the desirability of having small nuclear weapons for tactical use; the inhibition on the use of major nuclear weapons in the absence of adequate conventional forces; the question of control by a multinational organization over a NATO nuclear strategic force; and the necessity of making the U.S. nuclear retaliatory weapons invulnerable. It was recognized that if the Soviet Union moved at any time in force to cut off access to West Berlin, NATO would be ready to respond with necessary force.

##### 3. China policy

The committee discussed trade with Communist China. The members were agreed that there should be no trade in strategic goods. The Canadian members however, stated that in Canada there was general support for a policy of trade with China in nonstrategic goods on the grounds that to cut off all trade would not weaken the hold of the Chinese Communist party and that trade helps maintain the strength of the Canadian economy. The view was also expressed that it can assist in some measure to preserve a reservoir of good will in China which could be of long-term benefit to the West. Some U.S. members, while acknowledging that the United States does trade in certain nonstrategic commodities with countries of Eastern Europe, were of the view that trade materially assists the Chinese in reaching their economic objectives,

raises moral issues on which the U.S. public feels deeply, and strengthens the Chinese position in Asia.

The Canadian chairman referred with pleasure to the statement made in the House of Commons the previous day by the Prime Minister regarding the happy solution to the difficulty which had arisen over the supply from U.S. sources of grain unloading equipment and the committee agreed that this was a good example of continuing cooperation between the two countries.

The committee also discussed the closely related questions of diplomatic recognition of Communist China and its representation in the United Nations. While neither Canada nor the United States has yet recognized the People's Republic of China, it was generally agreed that the issue of representation in the United Nations would soon confront the two nations and that at the forthcoming meeting of the General Assembly there would likely be increased support for seating representatives of Communist China. The "two China" concept was also considered as a possible solution for the representation of China. It was pointed out that the admission of a Chinese Communist delegation to the United Nations would be interpreted in many places in the United States as an act of appeasement and might lead to strong demands that the United States leave the United Nations. The Canadian members pointed out that Canadian public opinion is divided on the issue.

##### 4. Disarmament

The committee agreed that disarmament negotiations must be continued despite the difficulties and lack of concrete progress so far. Recognizing the growing military potential of Communist China, probably independent of Russia, it was suggested that at some future time provision might be made for Communist China to participate in realistic disarmament discussions. Confirming the continuing need to seek agreement on banning nuclear tests under adequate safeguards, the committee was concerned as to how long the United States should postpone the testing, which is required to advance nuclear capability, in the face of Russia's refusal to negotiate an agreement in good faith. Only by thorough inspection around the world could each side be certain that the other was not secretly taking the lead in more efficient weapons. Canadian members reported that public opinion in Canada now was against resumption of nuclear tests, but could change in the face of continued Russian rejection of inspection and the growing possibility of the Russians conducting secret tests.

##### 5. Defense Production Sharing

In view of the interdependent nature of the economic as well as the military aspects of the common defense effort, the committee confirmed the need for a strong industrial base in Canada as an essential part of North American defense. The defense production sharing program continues to provide opportunities for Canadian industry to participate on an equitable basis with U.S. industry in defense development and production. The committee noted that since the initiation of the program, Canada continued to procure more defense items in the United States than the United States procured in Canada. It was agreed that efforts should be continued to strengthen the Canadian portion of the common defense production base through increased U.S. defense procurement in Canada.

#### Report of the committee on trade and economic matters

##### Aid to Underdeveloped Countries

There was a general discussion on the principles which should govern aid to underdeveloped countries and the problems of

implementing aid programs. It was agreed that there was need for more effective preparation and planning of aid programs and that proper training of personnel administering them was also important. Reference was made to the desirability of close cooperation between Canada and the United States as contributing countries, both in determining a fair sharing of the burden and in promoting effective administration. The U.S. delegation pointed out that the United States was now contributing about 1 percent of its gross national product to foreign-aid programs, and the suggestion was made by the U.S. delegation that this percentage might be a target toward which other countries might aim. It was agreed that this aid was necessary in furtherance of the aims of the developed nations in accepting their responsibility toward the underdeveloped countries.

#### Boundary Waters

In the discussion of the Columbia River, the Canadian delegation observed that there were certain problems in Canada that had to be resolved before ratification of the treaty by Parliament could take place. In this connection, it was pointed out that the Province of British Columbia had made the necessary amendments to its Water Act, and had authorized the British Columbia Power Commission to apply for a license to construct the Canadian works provided for under the treaty. It was also understood that the preconstruction engineering would be completed later this year. It was hoped, therefore, that the project would not be delayed unduly.

Concerning the Passamaquoddy tidal power project, a member of the U.S. delegation asked for an expression of Canadian views, in the light of the International Joint Commission report. A member of the Canadian delegation responded that the report indicated an unfavorable cost-benefit ratio which in turn suggested that the project would be uneconomical at this time. The U.S. delegation thought it might be useful to continue studies of the project.

The U.S. delegation urged the desirability of a joint study of potential traffic on the Richelieu-Champlain Waterway and of improvements to handle this traffic. Such a study was of some urgency due to possible alternative action by the United States on the Hudson-Erie Waterway.

#### Tourism

There was a discussion on the balance of tourist expenditures between Canada and the United States. It was pointed out that in 1958 and 1959 Canadian tourist expenditures in the United States were \$413 million and \$448 million, respectively, while U.S. tourist expenditures in Canada were \$309 million and \$351 million. Thus, there was an annual Canadian deficit of approximately \$100 million in each of these years. With this in mind, the Canadian delegation expressed concern over the legislation now pending in the U.S. Congress to reduce the import duty exemption accorded to returning U.S. tourists from \$500 to \$100. Both delegations recognized the seriousness of the problem and discussed several ways in which the present imbalance might be improved, including expanded Canadian tourist promotion and better arrangements for air travel on Canadian and United States transborder carriers.

#### Trade

The committee discussed trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc with particular reference to trade with Communist China. The Canadian delegation explained the recent sale of agricultural products to Communist China. It was pointed out that the whole matter of agricultural products and of foreign sale of foodstuffs was a problem of greater relative magnitude for Canada than for most other countries, since Canada consumed about 14 percent and exported 86 per-

cent of its wheat production, whereas in the United States the figures were just the reverse. The U.S. delegation understood the factors within Canada that resulted in these sales and explained the basis for the United States in not engaging in such trade.

Trade with Cuba was also discussed. The U.S. delegation explained the distinction in U.S. law between trade with Cuba and with Communist China. It cited the dwindling amount of such trade in the permissive categories of food and medicine.

Both delegations recognized that Canada and the United States had a common interest in strengthening themselves and in supporting and promoting free world objectives against the threat that faces them.

#### U.S. Investment in Canada

The contribution which U.S. investment has made to the development of Canadian industry was recognized but members of the Canadian delegation also drew attention to the problems which arose in Canada due to the large measure of U.S. control over certain segments of Canadian industry. It was pointed out that the Canadian Government had recently taken measures to encourage wider participation by Canadians in their own industrial development without penalizing foreign investment. It was also suggested by the Canadian delegation that it would be helpful if Canadians had greater access to the equity financing of U.S.-owned companies in Canada.

#### International Trade Unions

The Canadian delegation expressed some concern over the excessive influence exercised on Canadian trade unions by the heads of some U.S.-controlled international unions. Admittedly this was a matter for consideration within Canada.

#### European Trade Groupings

A Canadian delegate expressed the hope that Canada and the United States would consult to find a mutually satisfactory approach to the problems created by European trade blocs.

#### FINANCIAL REPORT

*Expenses of the U.S. delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group meeting, Washington, D.C., and Norfolk, Va., June 7-11, 1961 (to be divided between the Senate and House of Representatives)*

Washington, D.C., June 7-9:	
Transportation: Taxis, bus, limousines.....	\$95.50
Dinners, luncheons, for Canadian delegation.....	1,509.76
Reception, expenses, Shoreham Hotel.....	2,995.46
Miscellaneous gratuities, Shoreham Hotel.....	34.00
Subtotal.....	4,634.72
Norfolk, Va., June 9-11:	
Hotel expense, Hotel Chamberlin.....	210.48
Buffet, Hotel Chamberlin.....	171.00
Miscellaneous gratuities, Hotel Chamberlin.....	66.25
Reception, Officers Club, Fort Monroe.....	448.00
Meals, Fort Eustis, Williamsburg, Va., and en route.....	228.83
Subtotal.....	1,124.56
Total.....	5,759.28

#### FALLOUT SHELTER: FUTURE RUMPUS ROOM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, unfortunately for the taxpayers of this Nation, the Federal Office of Civil and

Defense Mobilization—before it was dismantled by Executive order of our President placing the defense of civilians where it properly belongs, under authority of the Secretary of Defense—undertook a \$3 million program to provide fallout shelters in various parts of the country, presumably as models, and to encourage homeowners to have contractors build civil defense shelters in their basements or to erect do-it-yourself shelters.

Not one paid civil defense official in my State of Ohio has constructed a shelter in his own basement or backyard at his own expense.

In the city of Shaker Heights, a suburb of Cleveland, a \$1,500 shelter, paid for from this fund, was constructed in the home of a policeman. Just recently, paid civil defense officials gathered at this home, 3651 Latimore Road, Shaker Heights, for a formal ribbon-cutting ceremony. Mayor Wilson G. Stapleton, of Shaker Heights, one of Ohio's great mayors and, incidentally, a member of the Grand Old Party, of which I am not a member, took a dim view of the proceedings. Just before the ribbon-cutting ceremonies and the announcement that Patrolman Matula had agreed to display this shelter for the period of 1 year to any inquisitive persons, as a part of the deal providing him the shelter free, Mayor Stapleton said:

I am not going to build a shelter in my own home for two reasons: First, I can't afford it; and second, I don't think a shelter will do any good if a bomb hits in this vicinity.

Mayor Stapleton, by the way, has been a highly successful lawyer and dean of a leading law school. He said further:

Up until now civil defense in this country has been a big "boondoggle." I would not urge anyone to build one. It is up to the individual.

Mr. President, Cleveland is one of the great industrial cities of our Nation. Shaker Heights, a suburb to the east and southeast, is another great city. About 30 miles to the south is the city of Akron—the rubber center of the world. Between Akron and Cleveland are huge steel mills. Were the Soviet Union to assail our Nation with nuclear missiles, one such missile striking on target anywhere between Cleveland, Shaker Heights, and Akron would create appalling devastation and terrible loss of lives throughout the entire area.

This so-called civil defense bomb shelter in the basement of the Matula home is not actually a bomb shelter. This shelter would furnish no protection whatever from the ferocious force of an atomic blast anywhere in the Cleveland-Akron area. It might well be a huge firetrap, and would doubtless be a tomb for the unfortunate persons crowded into this 11- by 13-foot area, who would likely suffocate.

James Donnelly, a national civil defense official, appearing in Shaker Heights for the formal opening of this demonstration shelter, said:

President Kennedy is asking all Cuyahoga County families to provide themselves with fallout shelters.



I repudiate that statement. Where is his authority to speak for our President? I challenge his ability to prove that President Kennedy authorized him to make such an urgent request.

Furthermore, what about families who live in apartment houses? There are many of them in Shaker Heights and elsewhere. Are they to be discriminated against?

In connection with this particular fallout shelter, Mayor Stapleton informed me that, according to contractors who have inspected this so-called shelter and the furniture placed in it, the cost to our taxpayers should not have exceeded \$500 or \$600, and that it is a waste of Government money, that that shelter has been installed with the ultra in furniture, a picture, and so forth. Now it is proposed that Patrolman Matula be furnished in this shelter—without any expense to him—a stockpile of canned goods, dry foods, and bottled water. The purpose is to enable the occupants to live there 2 weeks before they emerge into a contaminated and poisoned atmosphere. I hope the Matulas and their neighbors eat the food before it spoils. Forty-four thousand dollars of worthless medicine was dumped into Lake Erie last year by our local civil defense officials.

Mr. President, this incident is worthwhile noting as indicative of the waste of taxpayers' money in other sections of the Nation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio, under the 3-minute limitation in the morning hour, has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 more minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, we all know the possibility of an all-out nuclear war waged against us by the Soviet Union, and, in retaliation, waged by us against the Soviet Union and its civilian population, is so remote one questions the justification for paying out the billions of dollars necessary to afford any real protection whatever in such a contingency. An adequate national shelter program would cost from \$50 billion to \$200 billion.

Throughout World War II, this Nation and our ally Great Britain, and the forces of Nazi Germany, had huge supplies of poison gas. Yet, neither nation—not even Hitler in his last desperate year—dared wage war with poison gas. Leaders of each nation, very properly and logically, feared what terror and huge loss of life the other would perpetrate and cause were they to resort to poison gas. The huge supplies stockpiled under Hitler's leadership and possessed by the allies were never used—and never will be used.

Patrick Henry, on an historic occasion said:

There is but one lamp by which my feet are guided. That is the lamp of experience. I know of no way to judge the future except by the past.

I assert it is safe to judge that Khrushchev and other Communist dictators of the Soviet Union will never, never resort to an all-out nuclear attack on this Nation. Our instant retaliation would prove far more destructive of life and property than his ill-advised attack. The net result would leave the Soviet cities in rubble and many millions of Russians—men, women, and children—meeting untimely and horrible deaths. Then the Soviet Union would become a second- or third-rate power, Red China, untouched by nuclear warfare, could be—and probably would be—the only winner, emerging as a great power, possibly the most powerful.

I make objection, Mr. President, to building fallout shelters at taxpayers' expense, such as was built in the Matula home in Shaker Heights. If Mayor Stapleton and I choose to build a shelter in the basements of homes we own at our own expense, that is our privilege.

Doing this would favor a building contractor. He would then put in circulation the money we paid him. This would do our economy some good. Furthermore, the chainstore or corner grocery, in selling us canned goods, dry foods, and bottled water, would make money, and that money would also go into circulation and perhaps do some good.

In the end, the net result might be that we would have a rumpus room, or recreation room, in the basement. Furthermore, even though at this time we in the Senate are gravely concerned over tax loopholes and are trying to close them, it may be that the Congress and State legislatures would open up another tax loophole by giving tax exemptions to write off the cost of these recreation rooms, originally termed "fallout shelters."

#### PROJECT AMERICANAS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this morning's NBC's "Today" program gave 8 youthful New Yorkers a heartening sendoff from Rockefeller Plaza in New York City as they embarked on a mission of friendship and understanding to the students of 17 South American countries.

Operation Americanas began 2 years ago when Robert Hinds, of Gloversville, N.Y., decided that he wanted to do something to impress the students of South America with the true character of their contemporaries in the United States. His initial inspiration came from Pedro Recia, of Barranquilla, Colombia, then an exchange student at Cobleskill College, whose image of Americans and their philosophy was distorted and antagonistic. Bob was successful in reversing Pedro's erroneous impressions, and now he and his seven companions will attempt to get across a similar story throughout South America.

Their vehicle will be an Army surplus duck bearing the name "La Pata Valiente," which translated means "The Brave Duck," accompanied by an illustration of a duck created especially for them by Walt Disney. Their 7-ton amphibious landing craft will also serve as their home during the year-long jour-

ney which will take them to Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru, Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, and Bolivia.

Bob Hinds is president of the group and will serve as skipper and chief linguist. The other members include William Hayes, Yonkers, N.Y., mechanic; Walter Kutrieb, Tarrytown, N.Y., navigator and cook; Daniel Twomey, Worcester, N.Y., radio man; his twin brother, Tom Twomey, quartermaster; Edwin Naylor, Mayfield, N.Y., medic; Fraser Shaw, Bethpage, N.Y.; and George Burrill, Ticonderoga, N.Y.

Four of the group are singers well versed in American folk music. This talent will serve as an entree for the boys into the campus life of the universities which they will visit, and it is their hope that through the medium of music they will acquire the confidence and friendship of their young neighbors.

The project is a purely private affair. However, it has received the warm sanction of the Department of State, and financial assistance has come from their own communities, universities, and various professional organizations. The American Automobile Association has asked them to report on road conditions in South America, and films of their trip will be sent to NBC every 3 weeks.

Mr. President, the initiative shown by these young men is a heartening example of the vitality of young people of America and their desire to build world understanding and peace. I know all of us wish them Godspeed on their very worthwhile journey.

#### FHA WATER FACILITIES LOANS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Water Facilities Act of 1937, as amended, authorizes the Farmers Home Administration to make and insure loans to individual farmers and to organized groups for the development, conservation, and effective use of their water supplies and for the protection and improvement of their farmland with approved soil conservation measures.

The amount appropriated for soil and water conservation loans has gradually decreased each year from \$11,500,000 in 1955 to \$2 million in 1960, notwithstanding the need and demand for assistance and the accumulation of a backlog of applications for loans. Only \$3 million was made available for 1961 and that was committed during the first few months of the fiscal year. The same amount has now been made available for 1962.

At the present time, the Farmers Home Administration has on hand applications for loans from individuals and organized groups which would require \$14 million. The backlog of applications in Utah would require more than \$300,000. The FHA State director in Utah reported in March that he expected to receive new applications in 1962 which would require an additional \$525,000. His estimate did not anticipate the critical shortage of water now existing because of our worsening drought.

Governor Clyde, of Utah, reported that the snowpack in many watersheds

of Utah is at a near record low for the third year, and that it was imperative that every farmer or rancher and every irrigation company cooperate to the fullest in an effort to obtain maximum beneficial use of the short supply. Efforts to conserve scarce water supplies in the stricken areas of Utah will involve heavy investments for improved facilities that will accentuate the demand for this type of credit. The need in 1962 for loan funds in Utah will be more than \$1 million or one-third of the amount proposed for the entire United States.

Since the inception of the water facilities program in 1938, 913 loans totaling \$2,738,913 have been made to individual farmers, and 51 loans totaling \$1,824,000 have been made to organized groups of farmers in Utah, or a total of \$4,562,913. The repayment record on these loans in Utah has been excellent. As of January 1, 1961, 511 individual borrowers and 7 group borrowers have repaid their loans in full. The outstanding unpaid amount on soil and water loans on March 31, 1961, was \$2,590,618. As of this same date, only 1.8 percent, or \$47,637 of the amount outstanding, was delinquent. The loss on loan advances to individuals is only 0.07 percent. No losses have been taken on loans to groups.

This loan program for the improvement or installation of water facilities has contributed immeasurably to the development and use of precious water supplies on farms in Utah. Such facilities have permanently removed some of the hazards and risks in farm operations. It has helped some farmers to stay in business. In many instances improvements in land use and conservation, adjustments in farm operations such as the production of grade A milk and finishing livestock for market, and modernization of farm homes could not have been made without first installing or improving water facilities.

It is urgent that this program be expanded this year to help Utah farmers cope with the existing extreme water shortage. Wells have to be installed or deepened. Canals and ditches need cleaning and lining to prevent seepage. Irrigated land has to be leveled to prevent water wastage and soil erosion. Farm health and livestock production depend upon good quality water from improved wells, ponds, cisterns, and pipelines. The task of financing these improvements is out of reach of the individual farmer and State agencies.

The authority to insure loans made by private lenders has not replaced the need for direct loan funds. The record shows that private lenders have not supplied the necessary funds from year to year, or even within the same year, to maintain the program at a desirable level. Since 1954, private lenders have advanced \$459,980 in Utah, as compared with \$1,283,612 advanced as direct loans. It is evident now that the \$3 million proposed for soil and water conservation loans during 1962 will not meet even a very small part of the total need in the United States. The amount for that program should be increased at least \$20 million to more effectively implement

the authorities in the Water Facilities Act designed to help farmers fight impending water shortages, prevent soil losses, and protect their health and income, and minimize farming risks.

Therefore, yesterday I sent a letter to President Kennedy advising him of the imperative need of requesting a supplemental appropriation of at least \$20 million for the fiscal year 1962 for FHA soil and water conservation loans, and I hope my colleagues will join with me in supporting this request.

I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to the President printed in the RECORD following this statement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 31, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The amount of money available to the Farmers Home Administration in the fiscal year 1962 for soil and water loans throughout the country, and particularly in the drought-ridden Western States, is woefully inadequate.

The appropriation bill the Congress passed earlier this session provided for a total of \$3 million for these loans—and the FHA already has a backlog of requests totaling \$14 million.

This backlog of applications does not tell the whole story, however. Out of the total 2,173 requests on hand and received for loans in the fiscal year 1961, only 462 loans could be made with the \$4,141,441 available which included \$1,141,441 advanced by private lenders and insured by the Farmers Home Administration.

Excluding those applicants who received loans and the applications on hand May 31, 1961, 979 applicants most of whom were qualified for loans, could not be served because funds were exhausted early in the year. Furthermore, other farmers in need of assistance did not file applications because they were aware of the lack of funds. For this reason, the volume of applications filed and the number of requests on hand May 31, 1961, is not a good measure of the backlog or need for assistance.

Some of the need among individual farmers for soil and water conservation is being met under the farm ownership and emergency loan program of the Farmers Home Administration. The amount of funds available for the farm ownership program, however, is limited. Emergency loans can be made, as you know, only in areas designated by the Secretary of Agriculture where production emergencies have occurred. Loans cannot be made under either of these two programs to organized groups. In any event the need for soil and water conservation loans as referred to above is in addition to that which can be provided under the farm ownership and emergency loan programs.

The table below shows the number of soil and water initial applications received in Utah in each of the past 5 years and the estimated amount of funds that would have been needed to serve the qualified applicants:

Number of applications received

Year	From—		Estimated funds required
	Individuals	Groups	
1961.....	61	2	\$300,000
1960.....	74	3	400,000
1959.....	95	5	600,000
1958.....	72	4	525,000
1957.....	97	6	600,000

The decline in the number of applications and the estimated funds required roughly corresponded with the decline in the amount of direct loan funds available for soil and water loans since 1956. Direct loan funds available were \$11,500,000 in 1956, \$5,500,000 in 1957, 1958, and 1959, \$2 million in 1960, and \$3 million in 1961.

The repayment record on these loans has been excellent. Since the inception of the water facilities program in 1938, 23,928 loans totaling \$74,338,964 have been made to individual farmers and 435 loans totaling \$18,531,485 have been made to organized groups of farmers, or a total of \$92,870,449. As of January 1, 1961, 16,224 individual borrowers and 66 group borrowers had paid their loans in full. The outstanding amount on soil and water loans on March 31, 1961, was \$37,919,986. As of January 1, 1961, only 5.7 percent, or \$2,172,733 of the principal amount outstanding, was delinquent. The loss on loan advances is less than 1 percent.

I am sure that the requests from other States, and particularly other Western States, would show similar unmet needs, and similar excellent repayment records on the loans that have been made.

Your administration has already indicated its deep concern about the affect of the drought—the worst in 25 years in Utah, and equally serious in other sections of the West and Midwest—by taking action on several fronts to assist hard-hit farmers, ranchers, and livestock producers. The people are most grateful, but the drought continues to worsen.

I feel it imperative, therefore, that before the first session of the 87th Congress adjourns, that the amount of the funds available in the fiscal year 1962 for Farmers Home Administration soil and water loans be substantially increased. I hope the administration will send a supplemental budget request to the Congress for this purpose of at least \$20 million.

Up to this point private lenders have not indicated they can supply any substantially larger amount of funds under the insured loan program of FHA than they have been supplying. I regret they cannot carry a larger share of the burden of this program. But since they cannot, the Federal Government must increase its assistance. Otherwise, not even the most urgent requests for soil and water loans can be serviced in the critical months ahead.

With kindest personal regards.

Most sincerely,

FRANK E. MOSS,  
U.S. Senator.

#### THE NEUTRAL NATIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in November and December of last year, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and I undertook an extensive study mission to Africa. On June 29 I delivered on the floor of the Senate some of my own personal reflections upon our new African policy.

In my speech, I stressed the fact that African neutralism was not necessarily adverse to the interests of the United States and the West, and that, in fact, might well be beneficial to our interests. What we need to fear is not African neutralism, but rather that these new African countries will be drawn behind the Iron Curtain, thus losing their capacity for neutrality.

In our visit to Africa, one of our most difficult tasks was to explain to many Africans the dangers of Communist colonialism. In the last two decades, the



Soviet Union has gained control of one-third of the world. The U.S.S.R. has created the only new empire of our century, and it is the only nation which is trying to expand its empire. Most of the European colonialist countries are quickly getting rid of their empires. The real danger of the new African countries is not from the West, but rather from the Communist bloc.

It is greatly reassuring to me that President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk are emphasizing these points to the leaders of the new African nations. In Saturday's Washington Post, Roscoe Drummond points out these efforts of the President and the Secretary of State. This article, entitled "The Neutral Nations," presents an excellent analysis and explanation of America's position in this vital matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Drummond's article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**THE NEUTRAL NATIONS—A BID FOR SUPPORT**  
(By Roscoe Drummond)

President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk are using the visit here this week of the Nigerian Prime Minister, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, to begin to unfold a U.S. political strategy aimed to counter the Kremlin at its most vulnerable point: Soviet colonialism.

Nigeria, neutral in policy and pro-Western in spirit, a country of 40 million people and nearly as large as Alaska, is one of the most mature and stable of the African governments south of the Sahara.

Ever since Sir Abubakar first came to the United States 6 years ago, he has been seeking to apply to Nigeria the unifying concepts of the American federation and he has been making steady headway toward welding his country's 400 tribes into a remarkable degree of national cohesion.

Of all the African leaders, Sir Abubakar could be expected to be the most helpful and the most expensive to the President and the Secretary of State.

Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Rusk have three objections in view:

To alert the many newly independent, neutral nations to the dangers of Soviet colonialism and Mr. Khrushchev's efforts to prevent the U.N. from protecting them.

To encourage the neutral countries, in their own interests, to turn away from the double standard of attacking only the disappearing Western colonialism and leaving uncriticized Soviet colonialism, which is expanding.

To win ultimately the open moral and political support of these young nations for a common U.N. policy to support a world of self-determination against the world of coercion of the Soviet and Chinese Communists.

The central issue of the world crisis today, as Mr. Rusk sees it, is the announced determination of the Communists to "impose a world of coercion upon those not already subject to it."

This is why Secretary Rusk feels it essential to get on with the building of the world community designed by the U.N. Charter. The theme which he hopes the Nigerian Prime Minister will embrace and advocate to his fellow African leaders is this:

"It is here (at the U.N.) that those who would not be coerced can act together for a world of peace. We speak of uncommitted nations and we usually mean those who are committed to neither of the principal blocs on the present scene. But all nations have commitments arising out of their interests and out of their own hopes for the future."

Mr. Rusk's own basic proposition is that for their own self-protection the neutral nations in Africa and Asia cannot long enjoy their own self-determination unless they are willing to join others in resisting the Communist denial of self-determination in Eastern Europe and elsewhere. Self-determination is a single garment in a small world, and when it is torn by the Soviets in Europe or by the Chinese in Laos and Vietnam and Tibet, it will ultimately begin to unravel in Africa.

The United States does not expect the newly independent nations to involve themselves in the cold war dispute over West Berlin, although the issue here is Moscow's unyielding refusal to practice the policy of self-determination it proclaims elsewhere.

But the Secretary is preparing for a new battle with the Soviets this fall over Mr. Khrushchev's demand that the U.N. Secretary General never act on anything without Moscow's approval.

This Khrushchev tactic is a sword over the heads of all the newly independent nations. On this issue Mr. Rusk aims to rally the neutrals at the U.N.—for only the U.N. can stand between them and the cold war.

**PETER KIEWIT SONS CO. LOW BIDDER ON MINUTEMAN PROJECT, RAPID CITY, S. DAK.**

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following these remarks a news story from the Rapid City, S. Dak., Daily Journal, dated July 25, 1961, entitled "Kiewit Lowest Bidder on Minuteman Project."

Mr. President, the article is of special interest because of the general interest in the construction of Minuteman missile bases. The first of these was at Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont., and the bill was approximately \$61 million. The Government estimate for the second Minuteman installation, to be placed in South Dakota, was \$66 million. The low bidder was Peter Kiewit Sons Co., with a bid of \$56 million, \$10 million below the Government estimate. In fact, all four bidders bid below the Government estimate, although one bid was higher than that for the Malmstrom construction.

This is descriptive of the size of the project and will be of great interest to those who are interested in saving money as well as those interested in national defense.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**KIEWIT LOWEST BIDDER ON MINUTEMAN PROJECT**

OMAHA.—Peter Kiewit Sons Co., Omaha, submitted the apparent low bid today for construction of a Minuteman missile base at Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City.

The Kiewit bid was \$56,220,274, compared with a Government estimate on the project of \$66,548,147.

The project involves 150 silos, each 12 feet in diameter and 80 feet deep, plus 15 launch control centers. The project will be spread over an area 150 by 100 miles, roughly east, north, and northwest of Rapid City. A Titan intercontinental ballistic missile installation also is located near Ellsworth and occupies the other quadrant.

This will be the Nation's second Minuteman installation. The other is at Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.

Col. Thomas J. Hayes, commanding officer of the Corps of Engineers ballistic missile

construction office at Los Angeles, was here for the opening of bids.

Three other bids were received. Morrison Knudsen & Co. and Associates, of Boise, Idaho, entered a bid of \$58,210,000 for the project. A combine headed by Utah Construction and Mining Corp., Los Angeles, bid \$59,273,073; and a joint venture of H. D. Zachry and Brown & Root, Inc., Dallas, entered a bid of \$63,488,000.

The Malmstrom contract for Minuteman was awarded in March for \$61.7 million, more than \$5 million more than the bid on the South Dakota installation.

The bid price for general construction of the 150 underground silos compares with the \$28,587,945 bid for construction of three Titan ICBM complexes in the area. The Titan bases—each embracing three launching silos—are nearing completion at Wicksville, Hermosa, and Sturgis.

No current figure is available on the total cost of the local Titan program which is now in the installation phase. It will, however, exceed the original contract. In January it was estimated the design changes had added roughly \$8 to \$10 million to the construction phase. In 1959 it was announced that \$47 million had been programmed for the Titan base, which then supposedly represented less than half the ultimate cost.

The Minuteman is a solid-fueled missile, smaller and more versatile than the bulkier, liquid-fueled Titan. Reaction time of the Minuteman—the period necessary to launch the missile after getting the word to fire—is considerably shorter than that for the Titan.

Basic construction for the 150 silos will consist largely of earth moving and concrete work. Each silo will be over 80 feet deep, with width at the top some 35 feet to permit an entry portal and equipment storage. The equipment room at the top of each silo extends 28 feet below the surface of the earth. The missile is stored in the silo, about 20 feet from the bottom and fired from the hole.

Boeing Co. is prime contractor for assembly and testing of the missile itself. Aerojet manufacturers the second of three stages with Hercules Powder Co. responsible for the final stage. Avco has the contract for the reentry nosecone.

Boeing Co. expects to employ some 1,900 workers on the Minuteman project during its peak load in mid-1963. The entire project will call for some 5,000 to 6,000 workers, with overlapping of tasks resulting in an overall peak employment of some 3,000 workers.

Boeing expects to hire 20 percent of its personnel locally.

Minuteman workers will be partially housed in temporary housing developments planned for Rapid City, Sturgis, Belle Fourche, Wall, and Union Center. Boeing has charge of providing temporary housing facilities for all personnel associated with installation.

**WIRETAPPING**

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on March 30, 1961, I submitted a comprehensive bill on wiretapping to the Senate, S. 1495. In essence, S. 1495 is an attempt to balance the right of individual privacy against the need of society to protect itself against serious criminal activity. My bill seeks this balance by permitting Federal and State law enforcement officers to wiretap only for certain specified serious crimes and by declaring all other wiretapping unlawful and punishable as a felony. And even where authorized, wiretapping is to be subject to strict controls and reporting requirements, which are designed to deter abuses.

About a month ago the Deputy Attorney General of the United States submitted to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary the detailed proposal of the Department of Justice for a Federal wiretapping law. This proposal uses the structure and much of the content of S. 1495; in fact, it is essentially a modified version of S. 1495. Many of the modifications are minor language refinements, and they need not concern us here. Of the important modifications, some are a welcome tightening of S. 1495. I refer to the changes which would limit the Federal officers who may authorize an application for a wiretapping order and the class of Federal officers who may be permitted to wiretap; of the new provision which would require that the defendant in a criminal proceeding in which wiretap evidence is to be disclosed be furnished with a copy of the wiretapping authorization and the supporting affidavits at least 10 days before the trial; and of the revisions which would define more precisely the Federal crimes for which wiretapping may be authorized. These modifications are in the spirit of my June 7 statement to the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, in which I recommended changes in S. 1495 that would limit even further than the original version the power to wiretap or to disclose wiretap evidence where I felt to do so would not unduly frustrate the right of society to protect itself against serious crime. Unfortunately, there are other modifications that the Department of Justice would make in S. 1495 which I cannot endorse.

First and foremost, I feel that the Department of Justice is wholly mistaken in striking from S. 1495 all restrictions on State wiretapping laws. The present-day volume of telephone calls between individuals residing in different States is staggering, as we all know, and in the face of this volume I think it is essential that Federal law prescribe the minimum standards to which any State law authorizing wiretapping must conform, to insure that the right of individual privacy is not wholly forfeited. In my view it is intolerable that any State be permitted to intercept interstate telephone communications with no restriction whatsoever, and yet this is precisely what the Department of Justice version of S. 1495 would permit.

I have a second serious objection to the Department of Justice version of S. 1495. Under S. 1495 any application for a wiretapping order and the order itself must specify the criminal offense sought to be prevented by the wiretap or as to which wiretap evidence is sought to be obtained. The bill as submitted by me then provides that wiretap evidence may be disclosed in a criminal proceeding, but only to the extent that it furnishes evidence as to the commission of the offense specified in the wiretapping order. The Department of Justice would delete this limitation. The effect is that if a wiretapping order is granted to secure evidence of extortion, and the wiretap furnishes evidence of, say, income tax evasion, evidence of the evasion is admissible. I deplore the deletion made by

the Department of Justice for two reasons. First, it invites abuse by tempting a law enforcement officer to seek a wiretapping order in the name of a serious crime when a lesser crime, or even a fishing expedition, is really in mind. Second, it strikes at the basic premise of S. 1495 that wiretapping is justifiable only by the need of society to protect itself against serious crime.

My final objection to the Department of Justice version of S. 1495 is its deletion of the requirement that a judge satisfy himself before granting a wiretapping order that no other means are readily available for obtaining evidence of a serious crime. In its place the Department of Justice would make the ready availability of other means of obtaining evidence a matter which the judge in his sole discretion may give such weight as he deems appropriate. If we look upon wiretapping as an invasion of individual privacy which is justifiable only by the need of society to protect itself against serious crime, I think we must agree that the Department of Justice modification is wrong. Wiretapping is a very vital weapon in the fight against serious crime, but it should not be permitted to be used when the evidence it would furnish may legally be garnered in other ways.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say that order can be brought into the now chaotic status of wiretapping only if we recognize the conflicting concerns of the individual and of society in wiretapping. S. 1495 is an attempt to balance these concerns. And in this same spirit I offer these comments on the Department of Justice version of my bill.

#### RED CHINA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last Friday the Senate passed upon the China resolution. I was necessarily absent and did not vote.

On Monday the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] proposed a substitute resolution and spoke in support of it. I should like to have the RECORD show that had I been present and had the resolution of the Senator from Oregon been presented to the Senate I should have supported it, since in my judgment it sets forth the proper approach to the solution of a most difficult problem.

#### FORESTRY RESEARCH

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on January 31 of this year, I outlined to the Senate a national program for strengthening forestry research. This program would be an orderly step toward an ultimate adequate and effective attack on major serious forestry problems confronting the Nation.

Legislative action on the Interior Department Appropriation bill for fiscal year 1962 was completed when the conference report was adopted by both the House and the Senate on Thursday, July 27. In this bill a total of \$26,368,000 was provided for forestry research and the construction of vitally needed research laboratories. This is \$1,245,000

less than the amount included in the bill as it passed the Senate. The difference is due to the elimination of five construction projects and a reduction in the amount for one other.

The five construction projects included in the Senate-passed bill, but eliminated in conference, were as follows:

Sewanee, Tenn., \$125,000; Olustee, Fla., \$70,000; Alexandria, La., \$200,000; Warren, Pa., \$200,000; and Madison, Wis., \$300,000, a preplanning item.

The West Thornton, N.H., project was reduced by \$350,000 to \$50,000.

As much as I would have liked to have seen congressional approval of these six projects—for they are all very necessary—I commend the members of the conference committee for the fine treatment they have given our forestry research items. I was especially disappointed that funds were not included for the highly important project at Madison, Wis. We must make a special effort to obtain this item in 1962. This Forest Projects Laboratory at Madison is a national, not a local, institution.

Funds included in the bill this year will provide for construction of 16 urgently needed laboratories, as follows:

1. Riverside, Calif., Forest Fire Laboratory, \$975,000.
2. West Thornton, N.H., Forest Watershed Management Laboratory, \$50,000.
3. Gulfport, Miss., insectary for insect research, \$25,000.
4. Grand Rapids, Minn., greenhouse and headhouse, \$25,000.
5. Bozeman, Mont., Forest and Range Management Laboratory, \$175,000.
6. Wenatchee, Wash., Forest Soils and Hydrology Laboratory, \$300,000.
7. Flagstaff, Ariz., Ponderosa Pine Silviculture Laboratory, \$150,000.
8. Moscow, Idaho, White Pine Disease and Silviculture Laboratory, \$300,000.
9. Fairbanks, Alaska, Forest Protection and Silviculture Laboratory, \$350,000.
10. Laramie, Wyo., Range and Watershed Management Laboratory, \$150,000.
11. Bend, Oreg., Silviculture and Wildlife Management Laboratory, \$150,000.
12. Bottineau, N. Dak., Plains Shelterbelt Laboratory, \$130,000.
13. St. Paul, Minn., regional headquarters office and laboratories for Lake States forest experiment station, \$1,250,000.
14. Crossett, Ark., Loblolly Pine Silviculture Laboratory, \$50,000.
15. Athens, Ga., laboratory facilities for research on insects and diseases, forest products utilization, and silviculture studies, \$665,000.
16. Bluefield-Princeton, W. Va., market development center and related experimental-demonstration forest, \$450,000.

Many times I have emphasized, on the Senate floor and in committee, the need for these facilities in bringing about a dynamic and effective research program. Senators have heard me say, and I repeat:

Let us take our scientists out of the woodsheds.

Many Senators have joined me in this appeal. Not long ago I visited a new forest laboratory where forest geneticists are breeding superior pine trees. Only a short time earlier I had seen those same well-trained scientists attempting to do valuable and essential research in makeshift quarters without even the minimum required modern equipment. It is heartening to see—even miracu-



lous—the more rapid progress made possible through modern laboratories and facilities.

Increased funds appropriated this year for forestry research will permit a stronger and more rapid attack on critical tree insect and disease pests. Two serious diseases of the southern pine—a damaging stem rust and a root rot—will be brought under control more quickly as a result of this increase.

Critical forest fire problems can be attacked with greater vigor and more knowledge.

Needed acceleration of watershed and range forage research will be possible.

The tempo of research on wildlife habitat and forest recreation problems can be brought up nearer to the necessary levels the problems justify.

Research on wood utilization will find new and improved uses for forest products that will make for a greater utilization, a richer economy, and added employment benefits that flow from increased forest industry.

And research on marketing problems will aid our small forest landowners throughout the Nation.

The foregoing are some of the concrete results which will flow from increased forestry research and these new and modern laboratories.

I wish it were possible to move even faster in providing these vital research facilities, and I regret the 1-year delay in the cutback of funds for the six projects mentioned earlier. In my judgment, this is false economy. Nevertheless, I am proud that we have made a reasonable gain this year in equipping our scientists with more adequate facilities for this vital research.

I highly commend those who have joined with me in sponsoring this national program, and I urge every member of the Senate to support this vital program to its fulfillment.

This approved program is a splendid expression of confidence by the Congress in the National Forest Service and their fine personnel. It is also a challenge to the Forest Service to strengthen their forward strides in meeting the opportunities and the demands of our times. I trust that the President will promptly authorize the expenditures of those funds.

#### A UNIQUE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL VENTURE IN ALASKA'S FAR NORTH

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, today in Alaska there exists a unique school system, unparalleled anywhere in the United States. Because of its great size, scattered population, and lack of transportation facilities, Alaska faces enormous difficulties in trying to provide a public education to all its citizens. For many years the able educators who head Alaska's State Department of Education have been working to combat this problem, which especially affects Alaska's 37,000 Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts. They have made tremendous strides in setting up schools in remote places. It has been a hard task, which has required persistence, devotion, and courage. But

in another sense this task has been easy, for in every area in which a school has been built the school officials involved have had the unwavering and strong encouragement of the people for whom the schools were provided. These ambitious folk have lent their homes, their food, and their strong backs to this cause. Unstintingly they have given in order that they might learn.

And they have been rewarded. For in every corner of the huge State of Alaska small but comfortable schoolhouses, staffed by dedicated teachers, pupiled by interested students, stand through the long summer days and cold winter nights as shining bastions against the wind of ignorance.

I have in my hands today proof of the accomplishments of one of these schools. I would like to relate to you its story, for it typifies the founding of similar schools all over Alaska.

Prior to 1945 the 65 Nunamuit Eskimos who inhabited the area around Anaktuvuk Pass, Alaska, had little contact with white men and the outside world. They were dependent upon migrating caribou herds for their living, just as their ancestors had been for centuries. Caribou was their staff of life. It provided food, shelter, clothing, and tools. Their only cash income came from bounties paid by the Government for the killing of the wolves which prey upon the caribou. This provided guns, ammunition, flour, tea, and tobacco. There were no permanent homes, no school, and no post office.

In winter the people broke up into small family groups separated from one another by 20 or 30 miles. This was made necessary because the caribou herds broke into smaller groups which moved into the mountain passes where constant winds kept the mosses and lichens on which they fed relatively free of snow.

In summer, however, the people came together at Tulugak Lake on the northern arctic slope some 16 miles from the summit of Anaktuvuk Pass. Here they fished, made winter equipment and lived throughout the short arctic summer much as their ancestors had in the same area for some thousands of years. Thus their existence passed, unchanged.

But this was not to say that they could not change. For after 1945, with the spreading out of white settlements in Alaska's far north, an occasional pilot, geologist, or health official visited them briefly. With the coming of the white man came an increased awareness of the outside world. Ideas of advancement and self-improvement began to form in their minds. Two of their number managed to pick up English. In 1950 a U.S. census enumerator, Ethel Oliver, in fact the first white woman ever to visit the area, came to Anaktuvuk. Her presence, especially when the Eskimos learned that she was also a teacher, stimulated the desire for education and advancement.

We will build a school—

They said—

if we can get 10 pounds of oil and some canvas.

They also asked Mrs. Oliver to help them find a teacher.

Mrs. Oliver saw the enthusiasm and great desire of these people to become more educated and to learn more about the other parts of Alaska—a feeling, I might add which pervades all the Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts of Alaska—and she attempted to help them. She succeeded in getting Don C. Foster, then general superintendent of the Alaska Native Service and the superintendent of the Alaska Native Service school at Barrow to send a young couple into Anaktuvuk Pass for 6 weeks. Unfortunately, unfamiliarity with the North and the primitive living conditions hampered their teaching efficiency and they had to give up their plan to start educating the children. Nor did the native service provide teacher replacements.

Three years passed. During this time a post office was established. In 1953 territorial Senator William Beltz, of Nome, an Eskimo, tried to get a school started at the pass but it was denied by the native service on the grounds that the people were nomadic. Finally, in the absence of any other means of providing education, the Alaska Native Service transported several children to southeastern Alaska to boarding schools. However, this substitute for a school at home failed to meet the educational needs of these Eskimos, for though the children were not particularly unhappy, they were not eager to return to school the following year. They missed their families, familiar foods, and their own environment. It became evident that this experiment would not work.

Finally in 1959 the dream of the citizens of Anaktuvuk Pass showed promise of coming true. As the arctic winter lessened its hard hold upon the community, anticipation and determination, far stronger forces, took hold. It seemed that success was in sight.

This success, however, was not imminent. As more people looked into the matter and tried to form definite plans, more and more difficulties presented themselves. It was certainly evident that the living conditions for the school's teacher would be rugged. Whoever was to be finally chosen for the job must be someone prepared to sacrifice unstintingly his or her personal comfort for the good of her school, someone who was intimately acquainted with the ways of life of the Eskimos and their attitudes toward learning, someone who could adjust to this different way of life without sacrificing teaching efficiency.

There were other obstacles. In the Anaktuvuk Pass region there were no building materials. All materials for the construction of the school would have to be flown in. And again there being no wood to speak of, there would be no way of heating the school once it was built, short of flying in fuel oil. Costs here, since Anaktuvuk Pass is served by no airline, would be prohibitive. On top of all this the supplies could not be flown directly into Anaktuvuk Pass, but would have to be transported 15 miles over rugged country. Of course there were no mechanized vehicles in this roadless area.

Even the revelation of so many problems did not dampen the enthusiasm of

the folks of the village. For they persuaded Anna Bortel, who had been head teacher at Tanana School, to teach them in their church. In Miss Bortel they had found the ideal teacher, one able to comprehend their problems, one kind and sympathetic, and above all one able to adjust to all conditions that might face her.

School had finally started, the Eskimos were finally on their way to the knowledgeable state that they had been dreaming of for years. Men and boys, women and children flocked to learn. Whenever their normal daily efforts to survive and provide themselves with food and shelter could spare them, they went to the school. But even now our determined students were not satisfied. They wished a real schoolhouse for themselves, something that could be revered as the seat of learning and knowledge in their village. A monument to knowledge—small, unpainted, wooden—but a monument just the same.

Pursuing this aim with the same determination they had evidenced in a decade of struggle, the village council, the guiding body of Anaktuvuk Pass, wrote to Howard A. Matthews, Alaska commissioner of education, I would like to read their marvelous expression of determination and sincerity to my colleagues:

OCTOBER 20, 1959.

DEAR MR. MATTHEWS: We are writing and asking you for a school at Anaktuvuk Pass, Alaska. We have quite a few kids here that are of school age and they are waiting for the schoolhouse at the Pass. They want a school as soon as possible. We want a school up here, too.

We don't want our children to be like us who don't know how to write one word. We have two men here who do our writing for us when we want to do some writing, and we don't want our children to do the same. That is why we want the school to be put up here. Why don't we have a school here? We are American citizens. Our children need schooling. After reading this letter that we have written to you, after finding out two people here who do this writing for us, maybe you will start thinking of us as poor people who grow old without knowing how to write (our children will be like us). No, we don't want our children to be like us.

When are we going to have a school? We want to know when and what kind. We will be expecting an answer from you, we will answer you if you write.

Sincerely yours,

THE VILLAGE COUNCIL OF  
ANAKTUVUK PASS.

The determination of the Eskimos finally began to bring results. Wein Airlines started construction of a good airplane runway only one-half mile from the proposed school site. The Alaska Department of Public Works sent representatives in to arrange for the building of the schoolhouse. Another year passed but finally the school was built. At long last ambition was fulfilled.

Today under the able guidance of teachers like Anna Bortel, schools like Anaktuvuk Pass are in session across Alaska. They face many problems and much expense, but they carry on, sure of what they want.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that I have just told in very specific terms the story of Alaska as a whole. For we

Alaskans know what we want and we will struggle until we get it. We have accomplished much in our strivings, not the least of which was statehood, and we will accomplish more—much more. With citizens of ambition and determination like those of Anaktuvuk Pass we will forge ahead to develop our resources, attract new industry, complete the transformation of Alaska from wilderness to prosperous statehood.

My reason, Mr. President, for calling the attention of the Senate today to the inspiring story of the people of Anaktuvuk Pass and their efforts to obtain an education is to remind the Congress of the overwhelming importance of enacting, at this session of Congress, legislation to provide Federal aid to the schools of this Nation.

It may be recalled that, during the debate in this Chamber on S. 1021, the School Assistance Act, I pointed to the exceptionally high costs of providing an education to the children of Anaktuvuk Pass as an example of the reasons Alaska must have more assistance from the Federal Government if we are to have a good school system in my State. I then referred to the fact that, at Anaktuvuk Pass, the cost of heating the school, alone, is more than \$6,000 a year. To provide fuel for the 30 children who go to this school it is necessary to fly in some 75 barrels of fuel oil during the winter, as the lack of any other form of transportation makes this expensive means of transporting supplies necessary.

While the high costs of education at Anaktuvuk Pass may be exceptional as compared with costs in other parts of the United States, I believe the desire for an adequate education for one's children is as strong in all States of the Union as it is in Alaska, and at Anaktuvuk Pass. Every State in the Union needs the help that can be provided by enactment of legislation to provide Federal aid to education. I hope the story of the children of Anaktuvuk Pass will provide encouragement for the enactment of such legislation.

#### SELTZER SEES NO WAR IN 1961

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a very important article was published in yesterday's edition of the Cleveland Press entitled "Seltzer Sees No War in 1961—Cites Errors Made by Khrushchev." The article is a most timely one written by Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press.

Louis B. Seltzer is one of the great newspaper editors of this Nation. He is probably the only newspaper editor in the United States who has ever been offered appointment as a U.S. Senator by a Governor of his State and who declined the appointment because he wanted to continue in newspaper work.

The Cleveland Press is a paper of great circulation and prestige. It is the original newspaper in the Nation founded by E. W. Scripps. It is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, newspaper in the present Scripps-Howard chain.

The article to which I have referred, in which the editor sees no war in 1961, is in accord with my own thinking, but

phrased in a masterly fashion which I could not undertake to equal. It is of such importance that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELTZER SEES NO WAR IN 1961—CITES ERRORS MADE BY KHRUSHCHEV

(By Louis B. Seltzer)

"Sixty-one," in this 20th century, will be the "almost" year.

Also, it will be "The year of the big mistake."

"Almost" could have been world war III. There will be no war.

The "big mistake" will be Khrushchev's bad timing. He was impatient—perhaps pushed by Red China. But he should have waited. At least until the end of 1961. Better still, from his position, until the midst of the 1962 off-presidential year election, catching the United States riven by intense political battle.

Now Mr. K. knows he moved too fast, and, knowing it, he will find a way to back out as best he can. That, however, is only part of his problem.

#### TIMING WAS POOR ON BERLIN

His poor timing on Berlin now makes it much more difficult for him to move successfully elsewhere. Why?

Because all Khrushchev accomplished in his premature Berlin move (whether to catch the new American President unprepared, test him out, or because Russia yielded to Red Chinese influence) was (1) to solidify the Western Powers who were wavering among themselves. He also thus unified, to an unprecedented degree, the American people and at a time when they were debating some highly controversial internal matters; and (2) to make the rest of the world—especially that as yet uncommitted neutral world—apprehensive about both Mr. K. and his ultimate aims.

But that is not all. There is yet another disturbing reaction Mr. K. now must confront. This will express itself in the months to come—as it did already in the tremendous exodus of East Berliners to West Berlin. And that is the unrest again stirred up behind the Iron Curtain—a slumbering unrest that alternately has broken out and subsided, but which, throughout Russia's subjugation of its satellites, has been latently explosive.

#### SPENT TIME STARTING BRUSH FIRES

Had Khrushchev devoted most of 1961 starting, in his customarily effective technique, brush fires here and there, had he pursued the hitherto effective policy of keeping the Western Powers constantly off balance, exploited fully the Cuban disaster and fomented some more trouble in South America and Asia, his position would have been gradually and substantially strengthened.

The Western Powers thus would have been even more divided among themselves and unsure individually. The American political scene, in general, would have been the wild scramble it usually is preparatory for an off-presidential campaign of power jockeying in 1962.

Mr. K. has had it. Now he has to find a new and tremendous device to do it all over again—to break apart the Western Powers, disunify the American people, win back the hundreds of thousands of fleeing East Berliners and allay the apprehensions of a doubting world.

Having tried almost everything thus far, Khrushchev is going to be rather hard put to find such a spectacular device—and it can't be a Red China threat for that is potentially too dangerous for it could swing around and clobber him but good.



## SHOE IS ON THE OTHER FOOT

So, capitalizing for a change on Mr. K.'s "big mistake," the Western Powers and a united United States apparently have put the shoe on Khrushchev's other foot—perhaps the very shoe he emotionally ripped off at the United Nations and with which he pounded so lustily for world attention.

Thus 1961 will, for these and many other reasons, go down as the "almost" but no war year—and the year of Mr. K.'s "big mistake."

It could also go down as the real turning point in the world away from, instead of toward, the Kremlin.

This could come about if the Western Powers stay together, if the United States stays united and if we continue to strengthen our military position at home and abroad as both the President and Congress agree it should be.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have not had an opportunity to read the article, but I join in the glowing words of tribute in which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has described Mr. Louis B. Seltzer. I have known Mr. Seltzer for about 20 years, and he is indeed one of the Nation's great editors. He not only is a great editor, but also he gives of his time to matters of State, National, and local importance.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee for his fine observation regarding a great constituent of mine.

## COMMUNISTS USE NAZI TACTICS IN EAST GERMANY TO DENY SELF-DETERMINATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the news dispatches report that the Communists in East Germany are using a mythical scare of a polio epidemic in West Germany to impose restrictions on the freedom of movement of the people of East Germany and East Berlin. There is a shocking historical parallel to this action, which shows, once again, what little difference exists between totalitarian states, whether they call themselves Communists or Fascists.

Mr. President, on October 16, 1940, when the Nazis established the infamous Warsaw ghetto, the ultimate purpose of which was the extermination of the Jews, they too spoke of epidemics.

The alleged purpose of the ghetto, according to the official Nazi newspaper, was to avert the danger of an epidemic. Hitler's official organ of information declared that it was necessary to erect a wall around the Jewish quarter because it was a breeding place of contagious disease.

The phony threat of so-called disease has always haunted totalitarian regimes, when what they really fear most is the healthy air of freedom and the natural aspirations of peoples everywhere for liberty. This is the epidemic that totalitarian regimes are most afraid of. When the desire for freedom flourishes in the heart of freedom-loving peoples, no mythical polio epidemic is going to stop them from leaving the pollution of

Communist East Germany for the freedom of West Berlin.

This supposed epidemic, which is news to West German authorities, has been invoked by the Communist regime immediately after the month of July, in which over 30,000 people fled East Germany. This is the largest number since 1953, and I remind the Senate that 1953 was the year of the mass strike in Germany.

Two weeks ago marked the commemoration of Captive Nations Week. The sentiments that numerous Members of Congress, including myself, expressed at that time, have received a resounding vote of confidence from the American people, as reflected in a survey conducted by the dean of American pollsters, George Gallup. Seventy-five percent of the American people approve of U.N.-conducted elections in any country where people express a desire for such an election.

In stressing the rights of the peoples of Eastern Europe for self-determination, the West has a valid and inspiring issue. It is an issue of which Mr. Khrushchev is very much aware. It is a sore spot for him. The lack of self-determination is a scar on the hearts of freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain.

This is the real epidemic that communism is trying to control and I think it is time now for the present administration to take the lead and to consider actively the possibility of calling for U.N.-sponsored free elections. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gallup's article which appeared in the Washington Post this morning be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## THE GALLUP POLL—FREE ELECTIONS URGED FOR BERLIN, SATELLITES

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., July 31.—By urging "self-determination" for the peoples of Russia's satellite empire, President Kennedy could expect to win widespread support from the American people.

Such a course has been suggested as a possible U.S. counteroffensive in the Berlin dispute—one which would bring pressure on Khrushchev to practice in Eastern Europe what he so constantly preaches elsewhere, that the people themselves should decide the form of government they want.

Americans, in fact, feel that the fate of people behind the Iron Curtain is closely linked to the outcome of the Berlin crisis. Our withdrawal from the city, a great many feel, would virtually end all hope these people might have of winning their freedom.

In the case of Berlin itself, the public feels strongly enough about the right of all Berliners to a free election that a clear majority would go to war to back up this right.

The public's thinking about using self-determination as a "weapon" in the Berlin dispute is revealed in a Gallup poll "in depth" survey completed before the President's address to the Nation on the Berlin situation.

The public was asked several questions involved in the suggested use of self-determination. One of these—put to those familiar with the Berlin crisis—dealt with willingness to see that the Berliners themselves had this right:

"President Kennedy says it is the right of the people of Berlin, including Russian-controlled East Berlin, to decide for themselves through a free election what kind of government they want. Do you think the United States and its allies should back up this right, even if it means going to war?"

	Percent
Yes, should	61
No, should not	27
No opinion	12

The public was also asked:  
"Would you approve or disapprove of a plan to have the United Nations conduct elections in any country where people expressed a desire for such an election to decide whether or not it wished to be completely independent?"

	Percent
Approve	75
Disapprove	12
No opinion	13

## METRIC SYSTEM

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, "give an inch and he'll take a mile," "I don't have an ounce of strength left," "all wool and a yard wide," "he's just half-pint size," are all colorful phrases employing the use of words of measurement. They are handy phrases to suggest general attitudes or conditions. Alas, for precise measurement of distance and volume, the inch, pound, and gallon system is hopelessly confusing and timewasting. A recent editorial in the Medford Mail Tribune, of Medford, Oreg., highlighted this confusion stemming from our present system of measurement and the benefits which would derive from the use of the metric system. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, June 30, 1961]

## METRIC SYSTEM

An uncle of ours, a retired engineer, visited here not long ago, and one of our conversations concerned the relative merits of the metric system, and the hodge-podge of weights and measures now in use in this country and England.

His orderly mind rebelled at the confusion caused by inches (and fractions thereof), 12 of which make a foot, of which, in turn, 3 make a yard, and 5,280 a mile.

Likewise with cups, pints, quarts, and gallons (standard and imperial); also with ounces, pounds, and tons.

And he pointed out how they are based on nothing rational, and are totally unrelated to each other in any meaningful way.

He would be pleased to see a headline in the Mail Tribune the other day. It said, "Metric System Proposed to Legislators."

Hearings on the proposal are now being held by a committee of Congress.

Under it, lengths and distances would be measured in centimeters and meters; weights in grams and kilograms; wet and dry bulk in liters and their decimal multiples.

The United States uses a decimal system for its coinage, but that's about all. And England, about the only other part of the civilized world which does not use the metric system, still has a nondecimal coinage (which, incidentally, is about as baffling as anything can be, with pennies, thri'penny bits, sixpences, shillings, crowns, pounds, and other monetary units—some of which are, believe it or not, purely imaginary).

A considerable resistance to such a proposal is predictable, not only out of sheer habit and inertia, coupled with the difficulty of becoming acquainted with a new system of weights and measures, but also because of the very considerable cost to which industry would be put in retooling to adopt the metric system.

On the other hand, however, there would be a remarkable increase in efficiency and in savings; most scientific research now uses metric measurements, and those who do business abroad would welcome it for uniformity's sake.

The ultimate advantages would far outweigh the initial problems and confusion.

### WHEELS FOR MEALS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the great strides forward in the progress of man was the genesis of the wheel. Now, I am happy to announce that because of another wheel, the American consumer may yet make some progress in being able to determine the price per unit of goods sold in our markets. A slide rule wheel has been developed to help the harassed shopper to figure the better buy when confronted with conflicting prices and sizes in the same item. An illustration of the unfortunate necessity for such a device appeared in Mr. Bill Gold's column in the Washington Post of July 28. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A GREAT INVENTION, THE WHEEL

(By Bill Gold)

Being a thoroughly domesticated husband, I often tag along when the lady at our house goes marketing. On this week's expedition, she shot a hostile glance at the tomatoes and the prices posted for them, and said: "I can see it's going to take me a while to select some decent produce. You can save time by picking up some of the staples on this list."

I said OK, and started off to get the items she had listed for me. "I didn't mark the size on the soap," she called after me. "You figure out the best buy—genius."

I smiled patronizingly. Women make such a big production out of a bit of simple arithmetic.

The "soap" she wanted wasn't really soap. It's what the Food and Drug people call a "detergent bar." Soap manufacturers have convinced our lawmakers that they deserve to be exempted from regulations that require other products to have a label that spells out weight or volume of the contents. But detergent bars are not considered soap, and so are not exempted. They have to tell all.

They do this by printing the contents in the smallest size type available, and by trying to place this information as near as possible to an edge of the package. If your eyes are sharp, you can just barely make out the fact that there are three and a fraction ounces in the small bar, and four and a fraction ounces in the large. If your eyes are very sharp, you might see  $3\frac{1}{2}$  and  $4\frac{1}{4}$ . (The next day, under 20-power magnification, the fraction on the big bar looked like a "Y" over a solid dot. What I took to be an "8" is so tiny that the ink fills in the holes.)

The small bars were two for 27. The large bars were two for 39. Since I had no pencil I tried to figure the unit cost of each in my head. Try it yourself, if you think it's easy.

It took quite a while for me to figure out that it would cost more to buy the large

economy size than the small bar. Naturally, I was thoroughly irritated by this kind of labeling and pricing, and said so when I got back to the produce department and an audience that would listen to me.

"What you need," said the top shopper of our household, "is one of those best-buy wheels they describe in this week's Newsweek. It's written up in the business and finance section."

When we got home, I looked it up. It said:

"A slide rule to help shoppers decide which size package—large or small—is the better buy per ounce has been devised by Best Buy Products Co. of Decatur, Ill. The shopper rotates the inner wheel on the dial chart (photo) to line up the price of the large item with its size in ounces, pounds or pints; then does the same for the small size package. The best buy shows up in a window on the chart, together with the percentage of cost saved by buying that size package. Price: \$1.50."

I was pleased to find out about that best-buy wheel, but a bit disturbed to learn that my wife had been reading business and financial news. Do you suppose that as a result of shrewd marketing she's been knocking down enough out of her household budget to accumulate a nest egg? A nest egg big enough to be worth borrowing? I'd better look into this.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business (H.R. 7035) be laid before the Senate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(At this point Mrs. NEUBERGER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, the bill H.R. 7035, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations, totals \$5,161,380,000, an increase of \$833,923,000 over the amount of the bill as passed by the House, an increase of \$172,963,669 over the appro-

priations for fiscal year 1961; and an increase of \$157,248,919 over the budget estimates for fiscal year 1962. One-half of the total amount contained in the bill is for the programs administered by the Social Security Administration, \$2.5 billion being for grants to States for public assistance.

For the Department of Labor the committee recommends a total of \$679,829,000, an increase of \$396,716,000 over the House allowance, but a reduction of \$103,013,000 from the budget estimates. The substantial increase over the House allowance is attributable to supplemental estimates presented to the Senate after passage of the bill by the House, totaling \$497,700,000, \$490 million of which was requested for the additional funding of requirements for the payment of benefits under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, approved March 24, 1961. The committee recommends \$390 million for these benefit payments, a reduction of \$100 million, for a total of \$890 million provided for such payments contrasted to the original estimate of needs of \$990 million, reached in the early months of this calendar year when insured unemployment was at an alltime high of 3.3 million. Today the insured unemployment is around 2 million and the committee's recommended reduction under the amount sought is predicated upon this evidence of improved economic conditions.

Also included among the supplemental estimates were requests for \$7,200,000 to finance the discharge of the Department's new responsibilities arising from the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, approved May 5, 1961, for which the committee recommends \$6,150,000, a reduction of \$1,050,000 from the estimates.

For the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the committee recommends a total of \$4,455,365,000, an increase of \$435,231,000 over the House allowance, and an increase of \$260,528,919 over the budget estimates. A substantial part, \$217,842,000, of the increase over the House allowance is attributable to the approval of supplemental estimates, not considered by the other body, for grants to States for public assistance.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$1,580,000 from the House allowance for the Food and Drug Administration. As indicated in the committee report on the bill, while we are cognizant of the responsibilities devolving upon the agency to protect the food and drug supplies in the several ways required by law, the committee did not wish to endorse the administration of the programs as observed recently, by approving the budget estimate in its entirety.

For the Office of Education the committee has allowed the full budget estimate for six of the nine items. We added \$3,775,000 for land-grant-college aid to the State of Hawaii to give the full authorization of \$6 million, \$2,225,000 having been appropriated last year. For the defense educational activities the committee has approved restoration of the sums sought by the Department and restoration was made of



the reduction of \$500,000 in the administrative funds of the agency. The committee has reduced the House allowance for cooperative research by \$1,500,000 from the House allowance, but has still allowed an increase of \$643,000 over the 1961 appropriation. This action was taken after the committee was unable to determine to its satisfaction what projects of real value had been undertaken and completed in the past 4 years.

For the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation the committee recommends a total of \$88,397,000, an increase of \$1 million over the House allowance and \$13,878,000 more than the 1961 appropriation, but a reduction of \$24,050,000 from the budget estimate. The programs of the agency will not be adversely affected by the reduction, as the estimate contemplated excess funds in the amount of the committee reduction. By substituting an allotment base in excess of the appropriation the same results will be achieved.

The bill includes an allowance of \$1 million for the establishment of special centers for research and training in rehabilitation, with an affiliation with medical schools with strong programs in rehabilitation research and training. It is contemplated that two such centers will be established this fiscal year. The committee added \$1 million for research and demonstrations, to provide for an accelerated program in developing new methods and techniques for rehabilitation of the severely disabled.

For the Public Health Service the committee recommends a total of \$1,333,661,000, an increase of \$210,481,000 over the House allowance and an increase of \$280,385,000 over the budget estimates.

The principal increases for the Public Health Service are for grants to States for hospital construction, \$25 million, and for the National Institutes of Health, \$194,670,000.

The additional sums recommended for the Hill-Burton program would restore funds for part C, the original program, to the full authorization, \$150 million, the amount allowed in each of the last 3 fiscal years. The need exists for additional general hospital beds, and the States are prepared to proceed at the rate at which they have been operating for 3 years; in fact, they are prepared to initiate construction of more than 40,000 general hospital beds, the Federal share of which would be in excess of \$400 million.

The bill provides an increase of \$194,670,000 over the House allowance for the National Institutes of Health. This increase is firmly based on extensive testimony by eminent scientists and other witnesses well qualified to judge our national research needs and to assess the opportunities for progress that lie before us in the field of medical research.

The appropriation which the committee recommends for the NIH is substantial. It is also realistic. Although it does not provide for as rapid an expansion of our medical research effort as many sincere and persuasive witnesses have urged on the committee, it will permit the orderly expansion of the important research programs, allow the extension of the research effort to some

hitherto neglected areas, and carry forward the programs—which the Senate launched 2 years ago—to build up in this country a broad and solid base of research facilities for the future.

Medical research is necessarily a slow and complex process requiring a long leadtime between the initiation of new programs and the emergence of results that may be safely applied to human beings. Each step of a piece of work on which a life may one day depend must be taken with the greatest care. A sound research-support program must make adequate provision for extensive laboratory investigation, protracted animal studies, and, finally, cautious and closely watched trials on actual patients. The discoveries, the new cures, the more effective preventive measures which will be developed 5, or even 10, years hence are directly dependent on the extent to which we make support for medical research available today.

Medical research in this country has expanded rapidly in scope and deepened in quality, during the past decade, largely as the result of the unstinting support given it by the Congress and, especially, by the Senate. It has made progress of which we can all be proud. I am certain that the American people want no armistice or letup in the vigorous battle which our scientists are fighting against the diseases and disabilities that constantly threaten each of us. To keep up the attack and to permit the hot pursuit of every promising research lead requires that we continue to make a substantial investment in the future health of our people.

Such an investment is, of course, only justified if the Congress can be confident that it will be productive. For this reason the committee has taken particular pains to inquire deeply, during the hearings on this bill, into the recent accomplishments of medical research. The record is, indeed, impressive and most encouraging. The evidence left no room for doubt that our rising investment in medical research during the past few years is already paying substantial dividends.

I shall only cite a few random examples from the many accomplishments of which the committee learned during the hearings. The testimony fills more than 500 pages. I wish that every Member of the Senate would take time to read what is now being done to hasten the day when—as one of the witnesses put it:

Medicine, as it is necessarily practiced today, will look as primitive as the blood-letting of a century ago looks to us.

The growing refinement of therapeutic devices and the ingenuity of medical scientists is well illustrated by a small machine—no larger than a package of cigarettes—that was shown to the committee, capable of stimulating and regulating the heartbeat of patients suffering from complete heartblock. This compact device, using transistors and a tiny mercury battery, can be carried in the patient's pocket and, through electrodes inserted under his skin, will trigger his heart which would otherwise have stopped. If he wants to run up stairs, he can adjust a dial and step up his

heartbeat; when he wants to go to sleep, he can slow it down.

With the collaboration of surgeons at the National Heart Institute, there has also been developed a more efficient, electrically controlled, artificial heart pump which is used during heart operations when the heart itself must be stopped.

The field of cardiovascular surgery is, in fact, an excellent example of what can be accomplished by a vigorous research program. Every day lives are being saved and stricken patients returned to useful activity in their businesses and homes with the aid of techniques unknown a few years ago. For example, an operation was developed at NIH to seal a rupture of the great trunk artery that carries blood from the heart—a catastrophe which used to be fatal—with a plug shaped like a golf tee. Insufficient coronary circulation—a seriously crippling condition—can now be improved by surgery which rearranges the arterial connections to the heart in a way to stimulate the formation of new blood vessels. Damaged arteries can be replaced by plastic tubing. New techniques have made it safer to remove atherosclerotic deposits, clots, and other obstructions from small arteries, and such a dreadfully painful disease as angina pectoris can now be relieved, in some cases, by stripping the plugged-up lining from arteries. Diagnosis has been greatly improved by techniques which make it possible to X-ray coronary arteries and to detect congenital heart disease with a tiny microphone inserted in the heart. An emergency technique—suitable for use by lay as well as professional people—has also been developed for restoring blood flow in patients with cardiac arrest through closed-chest cardiac massage.

News of progress in the fight against cancer has been more encouraging during the past year than at any time during the last quarter of a century. Apparent cures have been achieved for nearly half of a group of women treated at the NIH Clinical Center for far advanced cases of a rare but highly-malignant form of cancer; a number of children with malignant tumors of the kidney have been restored to health; there have been longer survival rates for women with breast cancer and for children with a previously fatal cancer of the eye.

There has been continued progress in the nationwide cancer chemotherapy program which screens nearly 50,000 drugs a year in the search for effective anticancer agents. It has already turned up more than 120 which seem worthy of serious clinical investigation.

A similar broad-scale program has recently been launched by the National Cancer Institute to accelerate research into the relationship between viruses and cancer. On the basis of animal studies, this appears to be an extremely promising field of research and the committee has reason to hope that there may be some highly significant developments in the near future.

Virus research in other fields, such as acute respiratory disease, looks equally promising and is being vigorously pursued.

Drug developments are too numerous to describe in detail. There have been notable advances—in many cases suitable for immediate application in ordinary medical practice—in the use of drugs to correct, prevent or alleviate parasitic infections—such as malaria and sleeping sickness—systemic fungus infections, hypertension, muscular diseases, bronchitis, extremely severe pain, and some forms of arthritis—such as gout. The relatively new field of psychopharmacology is also developing rapidly and psychoactive drugs are already responsible for a significant reduction in the number of mental patients who need to be hospitalized.

A notable achievement of the past year was the successful trial of the first experimental vaccine effective against measles. Although usually a mild disease, measles can cause complications including pneumonia, impairment of hearing and sight, and brain damage and, in recent years, had been responsible for more deaths in children than poliomyelitis.

The prospect that it may also soon be possible to prevent tooth decay by means of drugs or, perhaps, even by a vaccine has been raised by some historic work with germ-free animals at the National Institute for Dental Research which seems to indicate that a specific organism may be the cause of dental caries.

Great strides are being made in the development of more accurate, more certain and faster diagnostic techniques. High-energy radiation sources developed by nuclear physicists have been adapted to medical diagnosis, radioactive gas is being used to detect abnormal openings in the heart, congenital heart disease is being identified before birth by fetal electrocardiograms, electronic equipment developed at NIH permits the detection and precise location of brain tumors without opening the skull, there have been significant improvements in cytology techniques for the identification of cancers, and a variety of other ingenious laboratory tests have been developed.

Progress has been such that greater attention must be given to making research results more widely and more quickly available to practicing physicians. The need for such a program is particularly acute in respect of chronic neurological and sensory disorders. Much can now be done to control epilepsy, to forestall mental retardation and cerebral palsy, to reduce the toll of strokes, to restore hearing to the deaf, to prevent blindness, and to alleviate disabling migraine headaches which cause more disability than the common cold. But the treatments for these conditions require rigid supervision and the special skills of scarce professional staff.

The appropriation for the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness therefore includes \$4.2 million for a new program of professional and technical assistance to State and local health agencies and other public and private health organizations to further the applications of research findings in these areas.

The list of positive achievements is long but the list of unidentified diseases,

unknown causes, and undiscovered cures is very much longer. For two or three centuries, while the physical sciences were rapidly developed, the biological sciences were relatively neglected with the result that the physicist, the industrial chemist or the engineer today has a much broader and more precise knowledge to bring to bear on the problems with which he must deal than the physician, to whom we turn when illness overtakes us. It is an odd—and, to me, disturbing—fact that we know more about the structure of the atom than the structure of the brain, more about making plastics than about curing the common cold, and more about building a radiotelescope than about preventing blindness.

Major practical developments in the physical sciences have almost always been preceded by major achievements in basic research aimed at the understanding of fundamental principles rather than the solution of specific problems. In the same way, major breakthroughs in our ability to deal with disease await a better understanding of the fundamental life processes.

It is difficult for someone who is not a scientist to describe—or even to understand—the important work which is being done in basic biological research. But it is not at all difficult for a layman to understand that it will, in the long run, make a greater contribution to and have a more profound effect on the practice of medicine than the empirical experimentation on which we must now rely to such a large extent. The committee was therefore very much encouraged to hear of the progress being made in the basic biological sciences. Advances in the study of genetics point to the possibility that we may some day be able to alter or control undesirable inherited characteristics including susceptibility to certain diseases. Better understanding of metabolic processes had already found application in dietary therapy to prevent a form of mental retardation which can develop in certain infants with a congenital metabolic deficiency. The complex field of body chemistry—in which knowledge is still so fragmentary—clearly holds the key to the prevention and the cure of a range of diseases the extent of which we can now only guess.

Basic research in the biomedical sciences merits increasing support and the bill therefore makes substantial provision for work in this area.

New opportunities for the application of the principles and the techniques developed by physicists, mathematicians, and engineers to the study of biological problems are increasingly presenting themselves. Such work requires specialized and frequently highly complex instruments and facilities not normally available in medical research institutions. To meet this and similar needs for specialized research facilities, the bill provided \$5 million for a new program for the support of special resource centers in which research using specialized techniques may be effectively pursued.

The extension of the research center concept into this important and rapidly

developing area fits into the changing pattern of Federal support for medical research. We have reached a stage in the development of the Nation's medical research at which the traditional and highly productive individual research project grants must be paralleled by the development of a wide range of research facilities through center grants and health research facilities construction grants; by the support of institutional research efforts through broad program grants and the new general research support grants authorized last year in Public Law 86-798; and by the creation of stable research careers through the new research career awards program. Only a closely integrated program dealing effectively with all the major facets of the Nation's research effort can insure rapid and sustained progress by making possible broad and simultaneous attacks on basic biological puzzles and specific disease problems.

Better facilities and increased research support will be of little value unless adequate and suitably trained manpower is available to conduct the research and to apply its findings to the care of patients and the maintenance of the public health. The committee has therefore recommended increases for most of the training programs and has instructed NIH to prepare a full report on long-range manpower needs and to make specific recommendations for the future development of the training programs.

The committee is compelled to recommend the deletion of two construction items inserted by the House. One of these would continue for a second year a \$5 million item for unmatched construction grants to which the committee took grave exception last year. The Senate conferees reluctantly acceded to its inclusion only on the understanding that this was a 1-year program and that there would be no further circumvention of matching provision of the Health Research Facilities Construction Act. The committee agrees the dollar-for-dollar matching requirement of this act may be too rigid to meet all the essential institutional needs for research facilities but it believes that any modification of the existing program should be considered in connection with the legislation now pending before the Congress for the renewal of this act. It is the view of the committee that no special or supplementary action should be taken through the appropriation process in advance of congressional action on the substantive legislation.

The second item which the committee recommends be deleted is a \$10 million appropriation for nonmatching grants for research in the construction of hospitals. The committee recognizes the need for such research but feels that it falls outside the scope of the NIH research activities. This proposal should properly be considered in connection with pending legislation to amend the hospital construction provisions of the Hill-Burton Act.

For the Social Security Administration the committee recommends \$2,582,498,000, an increase of \$221,055,000 over the House allowance, and \$1,971,000 over



the budget estimates. The increase over the House allowance includes \$215,400,000, the full supplemental estimate, not considered by the House, for grants to States for public assistance, principally to finance the Federal requirements arising from the passage of the bill providing aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, approved May 8, 1961. There is also included \$2 million additional for grants to States for maternal and child welfare, to allow the full amount authorized, \$25 million, for maternal and child health services.

The committee also recommends \$2 million for grants for training public welfare personnel under the authorization contained in the bill for aid to dependent children of unemployed parents which amended section 705 of the Social Security Act to provide such grants with no financial participation on the part of States, the old law having limited the Federal contribution to 80 percent of the total cost.

The committee has included two small items of increase for Gallaudet College here in the Nation's Capital, the only college for the deaf in the world. The committee added \$56,000 to permit the college to adjust faculty salaries to bring them more nearly in line with comparable salaries paid in other schools, and \$474,000 for construction needs.

For the National Labor Relations Board the committee restored \$400,000 of the \$667,000 reduction made by the House, and approved in its entirety the supplemental estimate, not considered by the House, for \$1,376,000 to permit the Board to handle more expeditiously the rising workload.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments of the committee be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 7, after the figures "\$5,000", to strike out "\$1,711,000" and insert "\$1,811,000".

On page 2, line 17, after the word "affairs", to strike out "\$444,000" and insert "\$510,000".

On page 2, line 21, to strike out "\$3,616,000" and insert "\$4,116,000".

On page 3, line 11, after "(63 Stat. 409)", to strike out "\$3,208,000" and insert "\$3,258,000".

On page 4, line 15, after the word "than", to strike out "\$9,600,000" and insert "\$10,500,000".

On page 6, line 7, after the word "than", to strike out "\$391,700,000" and insert "\$406,700,000".

On page 8, after line 15, to insert:

"PAYMENT TO THE FEDERAL EXTENDED COMPENSATION ACCOUNT

"For payment into the Federal extended compensation account of the unemployment trust fund, as repayable advances, as authorized by section 13 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, \$390,000,000, to remain available only until September 30, 1962."

On page 12, line 13, after the word "rendered", to strike out "\$12,167,000" and insert "\$12,667,000".

On page 12, line 17, after the word "Index", to strike out "including not to exceed \$50,000 for temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Labor (but not to exceed a rate equivalent to the lowest rate for general schedule grade 9) without regard to the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949, as amended," and in line 22, after the figures "\$2,100,000", to insert "to remain available until June 30, 1963."

On page 13, line 15, after the word "rendered", to strike out "\$12,261,000" and insert "\$17,761,000".

On page 14, line 12, after the word "operations", to strike out "\$23,580,000" and insert "\$22,000,000".

On page 17, after line 12, to insert:

#### "LAND-GRANT COLLEGE AID

"For an additional payment to the State of Hawaii, as authorized by section 14(e) of the Hawaii Omnibus Act (Public Law 86-624, approved July 12, 1960), \$3,775,000."

On page 18, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "\$210,857,000" and insert "\$211,707,000".

On page 19, line 10, after the word "source", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for graduate fellowships awarded initially under the provisions of the Act after the date of enactment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1962, which are not found by the Commissioner of Education to be consistent with the purpose of the Act as stated in section 101 thereof."

On page 20, line 2, after the word "purpose", to strike out "during" and insert "for".

On page 20, line 17, after the word "slides", to strike out "\$11,364,000" and insert "\$11,864,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "of which not less than \$550,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized."

On page 20, line 23, after "(20 U.S.C. 331-332)", to strike out "\$5,500,000" and insert "\$4,000,000".

On page 22, line 9, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$19,250,000" and insert "\$20,250,000".

On page 24, line 5, after the word "annum", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That subsection (g) of section 208 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 210(g)), is amended by striking out "\$19,000", and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

On page 24, line 19, after the word "prevention", to strike out "\$3,368,000" and insert "\$3,618,000".

On page 25, line 10, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$9,778,000" and insert "\$10,028,000".

On page 25, line 20, after the figures "\$6,493,000", to insert "of which \$500,000 shall be available for grants of money, services, supplies and equipment to States, and with the approval of the respective State health authority, to counties, health districts and other political subdivisions of the States for the control of tuberculosis in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General may determine, and", and on page 26, line 2, after the word "than", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$3,500,000".

On page 26, line 20, after the word "determine", to strike out "\$5,815,000" and insert "\$6,090,000".

On page 27, line 3, after the word "Research", to strike out "\$2,182,000" and insert "\$2,500,000".

On page 27, line 12, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$187,972,000" and

insert "\$212,972,000", and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "\$125,000,000" and insert "\$150,000,000".

On page 28, line 3, after the word "necessary", to strike out "for grants for research projects under" and insert "to carry out the purposes of", and in line 9, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$8,600,000" and insert "\$8,900,000".

On page 29, line 2, after "301", to strike out "and 311 of the Act, and for expenses necessary for demonstrations and training personnel for State and local health work under section 314(c)" and insert "311, and 314(c)", and in line 9, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$9,147,000" and insert "\$10,647,000".

On page 29, line 22, after the figures "\$50,000,000", to insert a colon and "Provided, That allotments under such section 6 for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of \$80,000,000."

On page 32, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "\$5,350,000" and insert "\$6,084,000, of which \$734,000 shall be available for construction of wharf facilities at the Rosebank Quarantine Station."

On page 32, line 12, after the word "research", to strike out "\$119,275,000" and insert "\$140,000,000".

On page 33, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "\$125,672,000" and insert "\$160,000,000".

On page 33, line 18, after the word "diseases", to strike out "\$92,182,000" and insert "\$125,570,000".

On page 33, line 22, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$105,723,000" and insert "\$160,100,000, of which \$1,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1962, shall be available for plans and specifications for a gerontological research building and appurtenant facilities."

On page 34, line 6, after the word "conditions", to strike out "\$14,681,000" and insert "\$20,000,000".

On page 34, line 11, to strike out "\$73,661,000" and insert "\$90,000,000".

On page 34, line 15, after the word "diseases", to strike out "\$52,182,000" and insert "\$60,000,000", and in line 18, after the word "Laboratory", to insert "and of which \$750,000 shall be available for modernization, including renovation and alterations, planning and construction, of the Rocky Mountain Laboratory, Hamilton, Montana."

On page 35, line 3, after the word "blindness", to insert a semicolon and "to cooperate with State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of neurological and sensory diseases and blindness by providing for consultative services, training, demonstrations, and other control activities, directly and through grants-in-aid," and in line 9, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$57,624,000" and insert "\$80,000,000".

On page 35, after line 9, to insert:

#### "NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH MANAGEMENT FUND

"The paragraph under this head in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 220) is amended by striking out the words 'cost of such operation' in the second sentence of such paragraph, and inserting in lieu thereof 'reasonable value of the meals served'."

On page 35, after line 16, to strike out:

#### "GRANTS FOR CANCER RESEARCH FACILITIES

"For making grants, as authorized by section 433(a) of the Act, for the construction of cancer research facilities, \$5,000,000."

At the top of page 36, to strike out:

#### "GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

"For making grants, as authorized by section 433(a) of the Act, for the construction of hospital research facilities, \$10,000,000: Provided, That none of these funds shall be

used to pay in excess of two-thirds of the cost of such facilities."

On page 36, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$10,084,000".

On page 37, line 21, after the word "methods", to strike out "\$5,275,000" and insert "\$5,375,000".

On page 39, line 3, after the word "amended", to strike out the colon and "Provided further, That not to exceed \$320,000 shall be available" and insert "and".

On page 39, line 19, after the word "fund", to strike out the colon and "Provided, That the advances made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the sums advanced for the same purposes for the first quarter of the current year".

On page 40, line 4, after "XIV", to strike out "\$2,285,800,000" and insert "\$2,501,200,000".

On page 40, after line 7, to insert:

**"GRANTS FOR TRAINING OF PUBLIC WELFARE PERSONNEL"**

"For grants to States for increasing the number of trained public welfare personnel available for work in the public assistance programs, as authorized by section 705 of the Social Security Act, as amended, \$2,000,000."

On page 40, line 23, after the word "Assistance", to strike out "\$3,221,000" and insert "\$3,663,000".

On page 42, line 1, after "74 Stat. 995-997", to strike out "\$67,100,000" and insert "\$69,100,000", and at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "\$23,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000".

On page 43, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$2,213,000".

On page 44, line 16, after "(Public Law 420)", to strike out "\$1,200,000" and insert "\$1,256,000".

On page 45, line 3, after the word "services", to strike out "\$127,000" and insert "\$601,000".

On page 46, line 14, after the word "Administration", to strike out "\$3,225,000" and insert "\$3,345,000".

On page 48, after line 2, to strike out:

"Sec. 204. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 15 per centum of the direct costs."

On page 48, at the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "205" to "204".

On page 48, at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "206" to "205".

On page 49, line 7, after the word "laws", to strike out "\$18,213,000" and insert "\$19,989,000".

On page 50, line 11, after "(45 U.S.C. 160)", to strike out "\$1,604,000" and insert "\$1,804,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Along with other Senators, I have the greatest regard for the distinguished Senator from Alabama. He is recognized throughout the Nation as an outstanding expert in the fields of health, welfare, and education. I know that the Senator from Alabama will recognize that in my questioning I indicate only the greatest respect and regard for him.

I am somewhat puzzled by the bill, because in the committee report I find that in some cases there are a series of enormous increases in the budget requests, at least proportionately. I and my staff

have gone over the hearings as carefully as we could. We have had great difficulty in finding precise justifications for the increases. In some cases we can find them, but in other cases it is difficult.

For example, for general research and services, in the division of general medical sciences—and this refers, I believe, to pages 30 to 32 in the committee report, and page 32, in line 12, in the bill—there is the following recapitulation. In 1961 the appropriation was \$76,695,000. The 1962 budget estimate is \$95,341,000, or an increase of about 25 percent. The committee goes up to \$140 million.

I notice that there are several programs which are listed, including support of general clinical research centers. It is suggested that this be increased to \$30 million.

I cannot find anything in the committee report specifically justifying this. There is also recommended an increase of \$7 million for training grants, and \$2½ million for fellowships. I cannot find any hard figures in the report to account for these enormous increases, of about 50 percent, over what the appropriation was for 1961. I wonder if the chairman of the committee could indicate how the committee arrived at their figure of \$140 million.

Mr. HILL. Some very outstanding and distinguished scientists and doctors appeared before the committee, who testified on this item. If the Senator from Wisconsin had had the opportunity of hearing that testimony he would realize that there should be an increase in this appropriation. We are dealing here with the very basis, the very foundation stone, of biological science.

For example, if the Senator will look at the testimony of Dr. Philip Handler, who is one of the most distinguished scientists in the country, and also a professor at Duke University—

Mr. PROXMIRE. At what page of the hearings does that testimony appear?

Mr. HILL. At page 1267. He is chairman of the department of biochemistry at Duke University and, as I say, one of the most distinguished scientists in the country. The Senator will notice, at page 1268, Dr. Handler gives the nature of this basic work. They are trying to ascertain certain facts:

How does a nerve transmit its impulse?

How does the brain integrate the nervous impulses which come to it and treat them as information?

What is memory? What is learning?

Exactly how does the action current transmitted down a nerve induce contraction of a muscle?

Exactly what is it that happens in a muscle so that it contracts?

By what mechanisms does the kidney guard the composition of the blood plasma?

What is the nature of the reaction between an antibody and an antigen?

This is very basic. It has to do with the chemistry of the body, sometimes called the metabolism of the body.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know that this is enormously important, and I know there has been some superb work done already. My position is that the Kennedy administration is very deeply concerned with the problems of health. The President himself was formerly a distinguished

member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Secretary Ribicoff is a man who has had deep concern with this problem. Their budget request was for \$95 million, which is a big increase, a very substantial increase. They must have recognized the importance of this kind of work. I am sure they did and do. What I am trying to get from the chairman is the reason why the committee chose to grant an increase from \$95 million, itself a big jump up to \$140 million, by such an enormous amount in this particular area. Where are the differences between the budget requests and the committee requests?

Mr. HILL. The Budget, of course, did not have the testimony before it that the Subcommittee on Appropriations had. We sat for days and hours and listened to the testimony. It was brought home to us, as it has been in the past, but particularly this year, how very important basic research is; how necessary it is if we are to understand what might be called the mechanisms, the operations, and the metabolism of the human body. It is necessary to have basic research. When it is done, then, in my opinion, we will have made a great step forward toward a breakthrough in the battle against the terrible diseases.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree that the testimony is most excellent; but my staff and I searched as carefully as we could to try to get some hard figures to justify the increase. Why is the increase \$45 million instead of \$5 million or \$500,000 or \$10 million? The committee rounds the total out to a nice even figure of \$140 million. I am wondering why the amount was made so high. What specific evidence was given to the committee to indicate that certain grants should be made or certain studies should be made, which would cost the specific amount justifying an increase of this enormous size?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Wisconsin will read carefully the testimony of Dr. Handler, which is followed by the testimony of Dr. Thomas, I think he will find the reason for the figures which have been incorporated in the bill. The fact is that we do not allow the full amount which was requested. We have provided some \$16,150,000 below the amount as recommended by Dr. Handler, Dr. Thomas, and the other distinguished doctors and scientists; but we have allowed an increase which we thought was necessary and vital at this time to carry forward this important work.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am trying to find in the hearings or in the committee report the precise amount which would be spent on additional programs over the budget estimate. I should like to know exactly where the money will go, and the justification for this kind of increase.

Mr. HILL. I will give the Senator a breakdown as to where the money will go. There are research grants, which break down into institutional grants, such as might be made to the University of Wisconsin.

There is a small amount for international medical research. I am certain the Senator is familiar with how much in the way of knowledge we have acquired from other nations.



Then there is a grant for special resource centers. I may say that that project will deal to a great extent with what might be called instrumentation. For instance, one of the most fascinating and, I should say, challenging results of this research, has been what we call transistorized pacemakers. These instruments stimulate and study the rhythm of the heart. When a patient has a heart block, he can use a pacemaker. Climbing stairs puts more strain on the heart. He can step up the pacemaker to give him a little more heart stimulation. As a result of the benefits of the pacemaker, people who might be dead now from a heart block are still alive. The pacemaker not only stimulates the heartbeat, but stabilizes it. The pacemaker tends to strengthen the heart to the point where the blockage, in time, will disappear.

Then there is the item of clinical research centers. They are centered or located at medical schools such as that of the University of Wisconsin, where not only heart specialists are working on these problems, but specialists in other fields of medicine, as well, including gastroenterologists, neurologists, internists, surgeons, and biochemists. There is much teamwork in that center.

Then there is a provision for grants for general research. A grant might be made for a particular study at, we will say, the University of Wisconsin. The reason I mention the University of Wisconsin is not only because the distinguished Senator is from Wisconsin, but because I know of some of the outstanding work which has been done at the University of Wisconsin.

There is also the fellowship program, a program which is most important. If it is expected to continue the research work and carry on the battle against the great diseases, it is necessary to have more and more trained specialists. It has been only in very recent years that an increasing number of persons have been trained for research work. Fellowships are awarded to doctors who are interested in science, who want to enter the field of research. The fellowships help them to get the training which they must have, just as it is necessary to have training programs for younger men, those who have not become so far advanced as those who receive fellowships. This is not a single-shot program. There are many different facets and phases in the program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On page 1283 of the hearings is a list or a table showing a breakdown of requests given in the same way as the chairman has so eloquently described the various programs. Will the Senator from Alabama state whether the budget request recommendation, which seems to total \$153 million, constitutes the amount of the request which was originally made by the National Institutes of Health, "General research and services," and so forth?

Mr. HILL. No; we do not say that at all. It must be remembered that the procedure is for the Government agency to make its request of the Bureau of the Budget, and it is within, perhaps, a ceiling which the Budget has already set for the agency. The agency then is in-

hibited from going over the budget. It cannot ask for more than the ceiling which has been placed on it by the Bureau of the Budget. Even where the agency may and does ask for more money, the Budget may deny that request. It may deny the increase.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to discuss some hard figures. I think the table gives the basis for them. In the first place, will the Senator give the detailed estimate for regular project grants, and then the figure for the committee recommendations?

Mr. HILL. The budget estimate was \$53,324,000. That is for research grants and study.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What was the committee's recommendation?

Mr. HILL. The committee's recommendation was \$87,100,000. In that connection, the House has already increased the funds. The House allowance was \$76,835,000, and the Senate committee figure, as now carried, is \$87,100,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The next figure is for international research.

Mr. HILL. That amount is \$500,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is the amount of the budget estimate the same as the committee recommendation?

Mr. HILL. It is the same. If the Senator will examine the table, he will see that it is the same.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I cannot find the table.

Mr. HILL. I do not believe the table is broken down quite like this, but the amounts are the same.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is there any change in the amount for scientific evaluation?

Mr. HILL. There is no change in that item.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What does that amount to—\$848,000?

Mr. HILL. I do not have that figure broken down in the table, but I can say there was no change in the amount.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The next item is clinical centers.

Mr. HILL. For clinical centers, we have provided \$5 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The budget estimate is \$5 million. What was the committee's recommendation?

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator speaking now of clinical research centers?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. The committee recommended \$13,500,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. An increase of about 150 percent?

Mr. HILL. No; the House increased the amount \$27,500,000; the Senate increased it to only \$30 million. The big increase was on the part of the House.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The budget estimate was \$5 million; the Senate figure is \$13 million?

Mr. HILL. No; the budget estimate was \$13,500,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That was for clinical centers?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What did the Senate committee recommend?

Mr. HILL. The House voted \$27,500,000. The Senate committee recommends \$30 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The next one is institutional grants.

Mr. HILL. The estimate was \$1,924,000. The House voted \$2,184,000. The Senate committee recommends \$2,648,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And the special resources centers?

Mr. HILL. There was no budget estimate on that item. The House voted \$5 million for it, and the Senate committee concurred in the action of the House. That item was put in by the House and the Senate concurred in it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What are the figures for just the fellowships alone?

Mr. HILL. The budget estimate for fellowships alone was \$10,100,000. The House increased it to \$10,290,000, and the Senate committee voted \$12,850,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then the training grants are next?

Mr. HILL. Yes. The budget estimate for training grants was \$26,500,000. The House voted that amount. The Senate committee voted \$33,500,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So to recapitulate, the Senate committee increased the regular research project items from \$53 million to about \$87 million, and increased the clinical center items from \$13,500,000 to \$30 million—an increase of about 150 percent over the budget estimates.

Mr. HILL. The research items were increased to \$76,835,000—

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is a correction from the first figure I received, then, is it?

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am talking now about the regular project grants.

Mr. HILL. I believe the Senator from Wisconsin did not have the House figure of \$76,835,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. All I wanted was the Senate committee figure.

Mr. HILL. The Senate committee figure was \$87,100,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. So the Senate committee voted to increase the regular project grants from \$53 million to \$87 million, or an increase of \$34 million, or an increase of approximately 65 percent, in 1 year.

Mr. HILL. But the House increased it to \$76,835,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that. But for the purposes of this colloquy, I am concerned now with what the budget estimate was, what the Kennedy administration requested, and what the Senate committee voted.

For the clinical centers, the budget request was \$13,500,000, and the Senate committee voted to increase that by well over 100 percent, to \$30 million; is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The House voted the large increase—from \$13,500,000 to \$27,500,000. The Senate committee voted to increase the \$27,500,000 to \$30 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In other words, the House doubled it, and the Senate committee added another \$2,500,000. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On the institutional grants, the administration requested \$1,924,000, or about \$2 million; and the Senate committee voted to increase it to \$2,648,000, or about 30 percent more than the budget estimate;

and the House did almost likewise; is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The House increased it to \$2,184,000, and the Senate committee added almost \$500,000 to that amount.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On fellowships, the budget request was \$10 million, and the Senate committee voted to increase it to \$12,850,000, or an increase of about 28 percent; is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The budget estimate was \$10,100,000; the House voted \$10,290,000; and the Senate committee voted \$12,850,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On training grants there was an increase from \$26,500,000, which the House voted, to \$33,500,000; is that correct?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So that was an increase of about 20 or 25 percent.

If the Senator from Alabama would permit, would not it be proper and fair to classify these increases as very, very large, percentagewise, in 1 year—recognizing that the Kennedy administration requested increases of about 25 percent, to begin with, from the amounts of the appropriations for 1961?

For these particular services in 1961, the total was some \$76 million. The administration requested that that amount be increased to some \$95 million. Now the Senator from Alabama has stated that the Senate committee has recommended to the Senate an increase over that amount. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The appropriation last year was \$76,695,000, overall, the total. The estimate this year was \$95,341,000. The House voted \$119,275,000, and the Senate committee recommends \$140 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Very good.

There is just one other section of the bill. I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for being so patient with me. I apologize for detaining him.

Mr. HILL. Not at all; I am glad to give the Senator from Wisconsin any information I can.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Alabama has been very helpful.

Now we come to the National Heart Institute. On page 38 of the committee report we find the figures for the National Heart Institute. The first item is "1960 appropriation." I assume that is a typographical error.

Mr. HILL. Yes, it is; it should be "1961."

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the 1961 appropriation was \$86,196,000; and the administration recommends an increase to \$97,073,000, or an increase of about 14 percent. The House voted to increase that to \$105,723,000; and the Senate committee recommends \$160,100,000—or an increase, as I calculate it, of 86 percent over the 1961 figure. In other words, the Senate committee is recommending to the Senate that for this 1 year that appropriation be increased by 86 percent.

Mr. HILL. I have not figured it exactly, but I would say the basic figures are correct—altogether some \$63,027,000 over the budget estimate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to say that I recognize, as do all other Senators, that heart disease is the No. 1 killer.

Mr. HILL. It is, indeed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question that any investment we can make that will move this program ahead is well worth making; it is an investment that yields great returns.

Certainly, I feel, as I am sure the President of the United States does, that we should do everything defensively to move ahead in this field at a fast rate. With that in mind, I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama if he can tell me in exactly what areas of the National Heart Institute's operations the committee has decided to go \$63 million over the \$97 million recommendation of the administration. The administration recommended \$97 million, which was a big increase, and the committee increased that recommendation by \$63 million.

Mr. HILL. That is a research item. The budget amount was \$66,187,000. The House increased that amount to \$74,358,000. The Senate committee figure is \$110,400,000. That is for general research.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The committee report, on page 39, seems to have these differences between what the House recommended and what the Senate committee recommended. I am reading from page 39 of the report, next to the last paragraph:

The committee therefore recommends that \$20 million be devoted to the establishment of clinical research centers in the field of heart disease. As already stated, it is to be understood that a portion of this sum may be used for the necessary alteration, renovation, or modernization of space and for the acquisition and installation of equipment.

Is this a brandnew program?

Mr. HILL. No. We have had the program for the past 2 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Why is there no reference to the amount spent before? The committee report states—

Mr. HILL. It is all in the hearings. The Senate was given information on it. It is not a new program. It has been going on for 2 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How much was spent on this program last year?

Mr. HILL. \$6 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So this would be an increase from \$6 million to \$26 million. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. To \$20 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. From \$6 million to \$20 million?

Mr. HILL. Yes. In the last 2 years, these centers have proved to be so worth while that there are compelling reasons to enlarge and increase the number of them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is an increase over the budget request. Did the Kennedy administration recommend any increase?

Mr. HILL. Yes. The Kennedy administration recommended an increase of \$2 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. From \$4 million to \$6 million?

Mr. HILL. No; from \$5 million to \$7 million, is really what it amounted to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. From \$5 million to \$7 million?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It recommended an increase of about 40 percent, and the committee recommends an increase of roughly 200 percent.

Mr. HILL. I have not ascertained the percentages. We have merely the dollar figures.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On page 40 of the report, the second paragraph reads—

Mr. HILL. I may say this about the research centers. When the Congress started those centers, there was no recommendation at all from the Budget Bureau for them. They were started by the initiative and action of the Congress without any recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure that was so. When was that?

Mr. HILL. Two years ago.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have a new administration, which is deeply concerned with such problems and has a different attitude from that of the past administration.

Mr. HILL. I know the administration is concerned with these problems, but it is also concerned with many, many other problems. I am sure no one in the administration has had time or opportunity to study these problems as has the committee that considered this bill and heard from all the witnesses.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me read from the first full paragraph on page 40 of the report:

Funds in the amount of \$15 million are therefore included in the appropriation for the construction and support of regional primate facilities.

Will the Senator explain this increase?

Mr. HILL. The primates are largely monkeys we bring to this country from Puerto Rico, and other places, that have proved to be the best possible animals on which to experiment. The third grant for primates this year went primarily to Wisconsin University. There is a nice primate colony there.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am very proud of what we have at the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. HILL. I hope when the Senator is up there next he will visit the primate colony and see the experiments that are being carried on and the work being done in the colony.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator assist me in determining what the figures are? What was the amount spent on the program last year?

Mr. HILL. \$7 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What was the recommendations of the Kennedy administration?

Mr. HILL. It made no change. It must be realized that this budget was prepared last fall and sent to Congress in January. There have been some items that President Kennedy himself has sent to Congress, but he has not undertaken to go over all of the budget and revamp, rehabilitate, or reconstruct it.



Mr. PROXMIRE. The committee recommended \$15 million, an increase of over 100 percent.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is one other area specifically mentioned in the committee report—

Mr. HILL. I may say that the witnesses, some of them among the most distinguished professionals in their field in this country, asked for considerably more money than the committee recommended. We held it down to this amount. The request was for \$25 million, rather than the \$15 million which the committee allowed. It was strongly urged that \$25 million be allowed. We reduced the request to \$15 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The next paragraph, second sentence, reads:

The committee therefore recommends that \$21 million be provided for training grants and fellowships so that these essential programs can be suitably expanded.

This is for training grants and fellowships in heart research.

What was last year's appropriation?

Mr. HILL. It was \$15,070,000 for fellowships and training.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In 1961 it was \$15 million?

Mr. HILL. Fifteen million seventy thousand dollars.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What did the administration recommend?

Mr. HILL. For this year?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Twelve million seven hundred and four thousand dollars.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It recommended a reduction?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What was the reason for the administration's recommending a reduction?

Mr. HILL. That was done in the former administration.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And the Kennedy administration had an opportunity to change it, if it wished to do so. It has a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This responsibility he has for the budget is as big as any responsibility he has.

Mr. HILL. I would say that opportunity was theoretical. This administration could not study and go over all the different items in the budget. There are many hundreds of items in the budget. It did not seek to revamp or rehabilitate or reconstruct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The administration certainly came before the committee to request budget revisions. There are some recommendations it did not support.

Mr. HILL. Yes. Supplemental estimates were sent to Congress because of legislation which was passed after the budget was prepared last fall. Supplemental estimates were sent up to Congress after we passed the wage and hour law, the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act, the law providing aid to children of unemployed parents, and other measures of that kind.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Can the Senator from Alabama think of anything more important for the Secretary of Health,

Education, and Welfare to do than to come before Congress, which determines how much or how little he gets, and tell Congress if he is dissatisfied with the amounts?

Mr. HILL. The Senator must remember that the Secretary is tied to the budget. He has no prerogative to testify contrary to what the budget recommends or provides.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator would agree, certainly, that the Secretary has every right to do so. He sees the President regularly. He works with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He is a member of the Cabinet. He is one of the President's closest advisers and friends. Certainly, if he had any feeling with respect to any part of this program, he would have every opportunity to go before the President. Did the Secretary ever orally indicate he was dissatisfied in any way with the budget requests?

Mr. HILL. He did not go into that phase of the program with us.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Did anybody recommend an increase at all?

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes, surely.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am talking about anybody in the administration.

Mr. HILL. No, they could not. For them to make recommendations would require that they start back with the Bureau of the Budget. They do not come to Congress and say, "The Bureau of the Budget recommends this amount, but we wish to recommend something else." That is not the way the budget operates. When the witnesses come to the Congress, they seek to sustain the budget estimates. That is what they do, whether it be for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or for any other department of Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The witnesses could come before the committee to say, "Although we requested x amount in the Bureau of the Budget, we wish to have it increased."

Mr. HILL. No, they are not permitted to do that. They are inhibited, and must stay by the budget estimate. They cannot come to Congress and ask for something not included in the budget estimates.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can go to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Bell, who is an appointee of the President of the United States and subject to his direction, and say, "We need more money for heart disease research. Your budget is actually requesting a reduction in training grants."

Mr. HILL. Certainly, theoretically, he could.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is not theoretical. That is his job.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator from Alabama were the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Wel-

fare he would not wait a minute before going to the President to say, "We must have this program."

Mr. HILL. The Senator should recognize the fact that this is not as easy to do as it is to say. This President in particular has many problems. Perhaps no President ever came to the White House with more tough decisions to make, with more responsibility upon him, with more burdens to carry, or with more harassing duties than the present President of the United States.

I do not have to enumerate on this floor what President Kennedy has been confronted with since he took the oath of office on the 20th of January.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that one of the requests the President made to the Congress was not to go above his budget estimates? Did not the President of the United States say this directly to the Congress in an address to the Congress?

Mr. HILL. The President laid down no hard and fast rule on that. The truth is that when a budget estimate is sent to the Congress, whoever the President is, there is the statement, "This is what I recommend."

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senate is free to do what it wishes to do, of course.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have pride in that.

Mr. HILL. I will say that for 8 years I sat as a member of the same committee in the Senate with our present President.

I know he uses his own head, his own judgment, and his own wisdom. Sometimes he went along with the budget estimate, and sometimes he did not go along with it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Exactly. The President was a member of the committee with the Senator from Alabama. This has been a principal interest of his, or certainly, at least, one of his principal interests in public life. He is thoroughly familiar with the problem. He understands it.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt, no one has more appreciation of the President than the Senator from Alabama, but I would have to say, frankly, that when the President was a Member of the Senate he was not a member of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and he did not serve on the Appropriations Committee which handled any of these appropriations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator agrees, though, does he not, that the President did say in his budget address in May that he urgently wished the Congress would not go beyond the budget estimates?

Mr. HILL. The Presidents always say that. Not to say that would be to indicate that there was a thought something was wrong with the budget estimate.

When the President spoke at Warm Springs, Ga., last October, he urged more medical research. If the Senator will read the President's address to the people on last Tuesday night, he will find that the President declared nothing

could serve the cause of communism more than if we let the present situation in any way impede or impair these essential programs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And the President indicated what he meant by essential programs when he made a request to the Congress. We certainly do not serve the cause of the President very well when we provide 50 percent, 100 percent, or 150 percent more, as the committee asks the Congress to do in some cases, over the budget estimates.

Mr. HILL. No. No. No. Of course, if the Senator simply wishes to say, "Me too, me too, me too," he has a right to do so, no matter what the Bureau of the Budget sends up, simply accepting the budget estimate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator from Alabama knows that the Senator from Wisconsin has not been a "me too'er." The Senator from Wisconsin has not been in the past, nor will he be in the future.

Mr. HILL. No. The Senator in 1958 introduced bills which called for the expenditure of billions of dollars. Now we learn that the Senator has taken the other track. The Senator has now taken the other track. That is the record.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator from Alabama would like to have the Senator from Wisconsin answer, I will say that I went over the bills the Senator from Wisconsin introduced in 1958 very carefully. I am sure if the Senator from Alabama would sit down with the Senator from Wisconsin to study them, he would find that the bills introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin in the aggregate would have saved money. They would have saved tens of millions.

Like the Senator from Alabama, I have always been an enthusiastic champion of education. Of course I should like to have an aid to education bill passed. That is what the Senator from Alabama would like to have. I am consistent in that position.

I say that we now have as the President of the United States John F. Kennedy, a man who deeply believes in this kind of program. He has made generous requests.

It seems to me it is perfectly proper for a U.S. Senator to stand up and say, "In this particular field in which the President is an expert, in which he has demonstrated his ability and wisdom and compassion, we should stand by his request and not increase it in some cases 50 percent, in some cases 100 percent, and in some cases 150 percent."

Mr. HILL. I shall not argue about the President of the United States, because, as I have said, I have the same respect for the President of the United States as has the Senator from Wisconsin. The President of the United States has not had either the time or the opportunity to hear the testimony, to get the facts, to know the compulsion with respect to the need for these programs as have the members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House and the members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. There simply has been no time or op-

portunity for the President to go into these questions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How much did the Senate add to the bill over what the bill provided as passed by the House?

Mr. HILL. The Senator will find that in the report. The bill is \$157,248,919 over the budget estimates.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That was not my question.

Mr. HILL. The Senate added \$833,923,000. Much of that amount is represented by the supplemental estimates, due, as I said, to legislation which the Congress passed during this session of Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Nevertheless, the Senate figure is substantially over the House figure, by many millions of dollars. It is \$157,248,919 over the request of the President of the United States in regard to this appropriation bill.

Mr. HILL. Yes. The Senator made reference to the House figure. This does not mean we are that much over the budget estimates. The Senator has been seeking to defend the budget estimates. This does not mean we are that much over the budget estimates. We have provided \$157,248,919 over the budget estimates.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Over the budget estimates, that is correct. I thank the Senator from Alabama very much.

(At this point, Mr. TALMADGE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I offer my amendments "7-28-61-B." I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc, and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc and will be printed in the RECORD, without being read.

The amendments, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

On page 4, line 8, strike out "\$4,976,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,476,000".

On page 17, strike out lines 13 through 17.

On page 18, line 18, strike out "\$211,707,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$211,207,000".

On page 22, line 10, strike out "\$20,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$17,250,000".

On page 24, line 20, strike out "\$3,618,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,368,000".

On page 25, line 11, strike out "\$10,028,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,778,100".

On page 26, line 20, strike out "\$6,090,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,814,500".

On page 27, line 3, strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,182,000".

On page 27, line 9, strike out "\$7,675,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,375,000".

On page 27, line 12, strike out "\$212,972,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$187,972,000".

On page 27, line 13, strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$125,000,000".

On page 28, line 9, strike out "\$8,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,100,000".

On page 28, line 18, strike out "\$7,424,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,604,000".

On page 29, line 9, strike out "\$10,647,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,147,000".

On page 29, beginning with the colon on line 22, strike out all before the period on line 24.

On page 30, line 15, strike out "\$49,835,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$49,332,000".

On page 32, beginning with "\$6,084,000" on line 1, strike out all before the period on line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$5,150,000".

On page 32, line 12, strike out "\$140,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$95,341,000".

On page 33, line 10, strike out "\$160,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$117,167,000".

On page 33, lines 18 and 19, strike out "\$125,570,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$88,324,000".

Beginning with "\$160,100,000" on page 33, line 22, strike out all before the period on page 34, line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$97,073,000".

On page 34, line 7, strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$13,933,000".

On page 34, line 11, strike out "\$90,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$68,740,000".

On page 34, line 15, strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$48,322,000".

On page 34, beginning with the comma on line 18, strike out all before the period on line 21.

On page 35, line 9, strike out "\$80,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$54,100,000".

On page 37, line 21, strike out "\$5,375,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,275,000".

On page 38, line 7, strike out "\$5,105,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,939,000".

On page 38, line 21, strike out "\$241,070,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$240,750,000".

On page 42, line 1, strike out "\$69,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$64,750,000", and strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$23,000,000".

On page 42, line 3, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$23,000,000".

On page 42, line 4, strike out "\$18,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$18,400,000".

On page 44, line 16, strike out "\$1,256,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,200,000".

On page 45, line 3, strike out "\$601,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$127,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what the amendments do is to reduce every item in the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, back to the budget estimates. This would save approximately \$297 million.

Mr. President, I think the colloquy which I have had with the distinguished Senator from Alabama brings out many of the reasons for this proposal.

The President has told Congress that we face a deficit of \$5 billion in the coming year. We all know that we have greatly increased military spending, and such spending will increase even more. Congress has added nearly half a billion dollars to the Kennedy military requests.

At a time when the Nation is being challenged and tried, as we rarely have been in our history, it seems to me that it is incumbent upon us to insist on the most thorough and complete justification for any kind of expenditures that Congress votes, recognizing that our military expenditures must be increased in a very substantial amount. Last year the President of the United States sat in the very chair that I occupy. He was recognized as one of the outstanding experts in the Senate in the very areas this appropriation bill covers—Health, Education, and Welfare. Few Senators—perhaps exceptions are the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the



senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—have had more experience than the President has had in this field, or are more expert in the field than is President Kennedy. He has requested Congress to increase substantially the appropriation over what it was last year. For example, in the area I have discussed with the chairman of the committee, general research and services, and in the division of general medical science, the request by the administration was for an increase of approximately 25 percent, from \$76 million to \$95 million. But the committee has increased the amount to \$140 million. They do not even give the figure to the nearest \$1 million, but only to the nearest \$10 million, and round it off at \$140 million and no cents, which is a 50-percent increase over the budget estimate, which is an enormous 85-percent increase, of course, over the 1961 appropriation.

I direct attention to the proposed appropriation for the National Heart Institute. Every Senator is concerned about this subject. The chances are that one-third or one-half of the present membership of the Senate will die of heart disease. We all have relatives who have died of heart disease or are suffering from heart disease. We wish to do all we can to overcome that illness. Consider the appropriation for 1961, in the amount of \$86 million. President Kennedy, who has shown great competence in the field, recommended an increase of almost \$11 million—\$10,877,000—up to \$97 million, an increase of more than 12 percent. But the appropriations the committee requests are not \$97 million or \$100 million, or \$110 million or \$130 million. They are \$160 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Earlier today the Senator from Wisconsin discussed the statement of the President at the joint session of Congress in his message of May 25. I should like to read into the RECORD exactly what he said at that time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The President said:

Moreover, if the budget deficit, now increased by the needs of our security, is to be held within manageable proportions, if we are to preserve our fiscal integrity and world confidence in the dollar, it will be necessary to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards, and I must request the cooperation of the Congress in this regard to refrain from adding funds or programs, desirable as they may be, to the budget.

The President specifically requested that we not add new programs or add amounts to the budget requests.

I assume that he implied, "I have given full consideration to these items. I have recommended increases. Therefore, I ask Congress not to super-add to the recommendations which I have made."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is correct. The position of the President of the United States on this question is absolutely

clear. No appropriation bill will come before the Senate with respect to which the competence of the President is more clearly established than in this field. He has asked us for an increase from \$76 million to \$95 million.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. The amendments before the Senate consist of a series of suggested changes in the monetary amounts contained in the appropriation bill. If any Senator believes that there is merit in some of the amendments but not in others, would he have a right to ask for a division? If so, would he have the right at any time up to the time the question is put on agreeing to the amendments?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to speak to the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin obtained unanimous consent to have all the amendments considered en bloc. Unanimous consent was obtained, and it could not be rescinded except by unanimous consent of the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Had I been present in the Chamber at the time the request was made, I would have objected. I was called to the cloakroom for a telephone message from my office. Under the circumstances, I ask my friend from Wisconsin if he will permit me to ask unanimous consent that the previous consent order be rescinded.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me explain to the Senator from California why I have elected to take this course. If the unanimous-consent order were withdrawn, it is my understanding that either the chairman of the committee—though I have not discussed this subject with him—or the majority leader, with whom I discussed it, might very well move to table my amendments. It would have exactly the same effect. There would still be a vote. There would be a vote on all the amendments en bloc anyway. I was informed that a motion to table my amendments could not be divided. It happened Saturday; it could happen again.

I sympathize with the position of the Senator from California. I think there is great merit in many of the provisions. For example, I know that the Senators from Hawaii are very interested in a provision of the bill which provides more than \$3 million for a grant to the State of Hawaii. But it is my position that every item in an appropriation bill should be cut back to the budget request. That is the only purpose of the amendments. I do not intend to submit any item individually.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Senator has the right to take the position he has stated, but when I left the Chamber the amendments were not then pending. Only the bill was before us.

I had a desire to be present and to object to any such request as my friend from Wisconsin made. While I was in the cloakroom making a telephone call the amendments were offered, and the consent request was made. I do not believe that fact in itself should deprive me of the right to object to a unanimous-consent agreement. I merely ask my friend if, on that basis, he would request that the unanimous consent order be rescinded, so that some of us might preserve to ourselves the right to ask for a division on parts of his multitudinous proposal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does not the Senator from California recognize that if I do so, there would still be a vote on the entire proposal, because there will be a motion to table?

Mr. KUCHEL. That may or may not be a fact. I am not a party to any such conversation in this Chamber. My desire was merely to preserve to every Senator the right to have any of the items in the amendment considered separately if he believed he wanted to take action in that fashion.

It may well be that parts of the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin would be acceptable to the Senate, while other parts would not. But when the items are put in one package and considered together by unanimous consent, a Senator is prevented from exercising the right which he ordinarily has under the rules to have the Senate pass judgment on each item separately.

I regret that I was not present to object to the request, I was absent from the Chamber for only a few seconds.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the concern of the Senator from California will be taken care of by the fact that the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] intends to adopt a different procedure in his approach to the problem. Of course, the Senator from California and other Senators who wish to vote against individual specific items in the amendment are free to vote against all the amendments. I presume they will. When the Senator from Connecticut offers his amendment, which is very close to what the Senator from Wisconsin has offered, the Senator from California can express his position on the principle. That seems to me to be an effective approach.

Mr. KUCHEL. I regret that I was obliged to leave the Chamber for not more than a minute and a half. At the time I left the discussion was general. No amendment was pending.

I have been here since we convened the session today. I had in mind, as I looked over the very many items in the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, that I might want to ask for a division of some of them, and that, conceivably, some other Senators might want to do the same thing. When I entered the Chamber there were three Senators on the floor, the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Wisconsin, and myself, and I believe the Senator from Hawaii then came into the Chamber. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin

if he would not give me and other Senators an opportunity to invoke the rule of division if any of us desires to do so. If the situation were reversed, I would immediately ask unanimous consent that any prior consent agreement of mine be vitiated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. All I can say is that I was very anxious to have the unanimous-consent agreement granted. I did not know that I could have it granted. I asked for it in the proper order, and I received unanimous consent. If I cannot get a vote this way, it seems to me my proposal does not have very much meaning. Individual Senators may disagree with my amendment and say, "This particular item is of deep interest to my State, and I cannot vote for it." The only principle which I can offer this proposal is to ask for a vote on the whole thing.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senate can do anything it wants to. However, I regret that at the very moment while I was off the floor accepting a telephone call from my office a unanimous-consent agreement should be requested, which I would have opposed had I been on the floor. I do not believe that kind of practice ought to be indulged in by Members of the Senate. I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin refuses to accede to the request I make. If that is so, the Senate is bound. It was bound, let the RECORD show, when there were not more than three Senators on the floor. Let the RECORD clearly indicate that.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say one more thing, if I may, before I take my seat. Unanimous-consent requests usually are made after a quorum call, so as to prevent any Senator from being denied what is his right under the rule. We have come to a pretty pass in the Senate if a unanimous-consent request is granted in the absence of almost all of the 100 Members of the Senate. I regret very much that the Senator from Wisconsin takes that position.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Assuming that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin is defeated, may any Senator move as an amendment to the bill any single item contained in his omnibus amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Each one of the amendments would lie individually in order. The Chair may also advise the Senator from New York that amendments are in order to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I should like to refer to the reference the distinguished Senator has made to the item which this amendment would eliminate on page 17, lines 13 through 17, and to

ask the Senator this question: Is the Senator familiar with the reason why this item for \$3,775,000 was inserted in the bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure that the argument for it is excellent. I am sure it is an extremely worthy cause. Of course the Senator from Hawaii has a very deep interest in it.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. The Interior Committees of the House and Senate a year ago studied this matter. It was an effort to attain equity for Hawaii, because our land college is the only land college without any land. All of the other 49 States were granted land in accordance with the formula set up in 1862 in the Morrill Act. It was felt that unless something like this were done Hawaii would not be treated on the basis of equity with the other 49 States. I sat through a number of the discussions, and consideration was given to the amount to be recommended. The amount ranged from a minimum of \$2 million to a maximum of \$36 million, as the amount to be granted in lieu of land. It was finally decided that the amount should be \$6 million.

With that knowledge as a background I should like to ask the Senator a question: Is there not some danger, if the amendment of the Senator were adopted, and this amount eliminated, we would be doing violence to equity?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to say to the Senator from Hawaii that of course I am aware of the statement in the committee report:

Testimony presented to the committee indicated that 7 out of the last 10 States admitted to the Union, excluding Alaska, possess land grants exceeding \$6 million if unsold lands from the land grant are valued at \$50 an acre.

That is the only basis in the committee report for adopting this particular measure. I cannot see what is wrong with the congressional delegation from Hawaii appealing to the administration. Those people are equitable and fair-minded men, and I am sure they would give consideration to their request. It would be better public policy for this request to go through the administration. The administration probably would have a better perspective than Members of Congress have, who have great consideration for each other. If this kind of amendment had gone through the regular process, through the Bureau of the Budget, any possible inequity toward Hawaii or the United States as a whole could be corrected. Is there any hurry about this? Suppose this matter were delayed. I am sure if it were delayed justice could be done in the near future.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Some of us have the feeling that the longer it is delayed the less likely it is that it will be done correctly. We do not have any assurance that we will ever get a cash payment in lieu of land, in the interest of equity. We sincerely hope that when a vote is taken that the amendment, from our standpoint, will be rejected. We appreciate the interest of the distinguished Senator in national economy, but we hope at this point that his opinion will not prevail.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Do I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin is in sympathy with the amendment which was added by the committee relative to the State of Hawaii in its request for \$3,775,000?

Mr. PROXMIRE. My position is that the amendment undoubtedly has considerable merit. I am also taking the position, however, that I think the administration should have an opportunity to pass on it, yes or no. This request is not in the budget, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. FONG. Yes. If I were to tell the Senator that the Eisenhower administration did request it and that the Senate passed it last year, what would the Senator say to that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would say, under those circumstances, in voting for a recommendation of the administration, that it should follow the orderly procedure and that the administration should have an opportunity to evaluate it. Why did the Kennedy administration not recommend it?

Mr. FONG. I do not know. I do know that the Interior Committee of the House and Interior Committee of the Senate authorized the appropriation of \$6 million for the land grant college at the University of Hawaii, that the Senate passed the appropriation last year, but that during the conference between the House and the Senate the House prevailed and Congress reduced the amount to \$2,225,000.

This year the matter was again brought up before the committee, and the committee saw fit to appropriate the additional amount of \$3,775,000. Last year, when the authorization bill appeared before the Senate, it passed the Senate without a dissenting vote, and it passed the House of Representatives also.

This item implements the authorization which was passed last year. This is the balance of \$6 million which was authorized by the authorization bill. It is a sum of \$3,775,000, set aside for the University of Hawaii land grant college. The sum of \$6 million did not appear from thin air. The State of Hawaii is entitled to the \$6 million.

The State of Hawaii, under the Morrill Act of 1862, would be entitled to 90,000 acres of land, 30,000 acres for each Member of Congress. Having three Members of Congress, two in the Senate and one in the House, Hawaii is entitled to 90,000 acres of land. Every State in the Union, regardless of whether it entered the Union prior or subsequent to the passage of the Morrill Act, was given a land grant. But in States where there were no public lands, the State was given scrip equivalent to the value of the land grant.

If we consider the value of land in the State of Hawaii—and Hawaii does not have large tracts of land available—but if land were available, then it would cost the U.S. Government around \$200 million to buy 90,000 acres. In fact, land near the University of Hawaii sells for about \$7,500 an acre. At that price, 90,000



acres of land would cost the U.S. Government \$675 million.

These figures were presented to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs. The committees, in their wisdom, said Hawaii was entitled to \$6 million, and they authorized that amount, and the amount was subsequently approved by both the House and Senate.

Hawaii joined the Union as an independent nation. Hawaii was not carved out of the land of the public domain, as were the Western States; or carved out of land acquired in the Gadsden Purchase, the Louisiana Purchase, or acquired under treaty with Mexico. In 1898, as an independent nation, sovereign unto herself, Hawaii, by treaty of annexation, joined the Union. At that time, her public land was ceded to the United States of America. The U.S. Government has seen fit to take much of Hawaii's public land and use it for military and other governmental purposes. So today the U.S. Government is occupying thousands of acres of land in Hawaii. I daresay it would cost many millions of dollars if the U.S. Government were to compensate the State of Hawaii the full amount that it should be compensated for these lands. Hawaii is in a unique position compared with other States. The other States, especially the Western States, were carved out of land owned by the United States. When those States came into the Union, under the Morrill Act each State received 30,000 acres of land for each Member of Congress. These lands were given from the public domain. These lands were originally bought by the U.S. Government and then given to the various States upon their assuming statehood.

Hawaii having ceded its land to the United States, and the United States now occupying the land, and using it for military and other governmental purposes—and we are glad to have the U.S. Government use our land for these purposes—certainly deserves consideration. The amount of \$6 million which has been authorized by Congress is a minimal amount. We feel we are entitled to at least \$100 million, as the equivalent of a land grant, if the spirit of the Morrill Act is to be carried out.

I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, in good faith and conscience, to delete this item from his list of amendments, because I feel equity and justice should be done Hawaii. My State needs the \$3,775,000. That amount will not be spent, but will be invested at perhaps 3½ percent interest and will produce revenue to meet some of the operating expenses of the University of Hawaii.

The University of Hawaii is a land-grant college. Its student body exceeds 9,000. It is famous for its marine biology, for its tropical agriculture, for its oriental and Pacific studies. This sum of \$3,775,000 is most important to the orderly and rapid development of our university.

(At this point, Mr. METCALF took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the answer is the answer I think I have to make. I have to be firm. I have to in-

sist that this principle be enforced in every single item of the bill.

I think an exceptionally strong case can be made for research into cancer and heart disease and on many other items. However, I take the position that we must go back to the budget request.

The senior Senator from Hawaii is an eloquent salesman, as is the junior Senator from Hawaii. Perhaps the Senators from Hawaii are not getting a fair deal, and in all likelihood the amount should be higher. That is why I say the administration should consider the question further. Perhaps it will agree that it has not provided enough. After all, if \$100 million is a minimal amount, perhaps the Senators from Hawaii may not have made the best deal by taking the bird in the hand. Perhaps the bird in the bush would be better.

Mr. FONG. I am happy to know that the Senator from Wisconsin feels that Hawaii deserves more than the amount which is proposed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say: Perhaps it does. I listened carefully to the statement of the Senator from Hawaii. He is persuasive. I do not want his eloquence to overpower me, but I believe the case he has made is a strong one. It indicates that Hawaii will not eventually lose that amount. This is a matter of a little time. I feel certain the administration will consider the question and make a request and ask Congress to observe the request. When the administration makes any request, it is not a matter of Congress decreasing or increasing it; it is a matter of our establishing a program which is based on the request.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his kind remarks and for feeling that the State of Hawaii probably deserves more than the \$3,775,000 for which we are asking. Should his amendment prevail—and I hope it will not—I trust he will support us when we bring up our amendment for Hawaii later.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment simply reduces, back to the amount of the President's request, every item in the budget. In doing so, it will save \$297 million. There are no exceptions, although some exceptions, such as the one which has just been discussed are very, very tempting, and for many reasons. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the principle of reducing the budget or the appropriation request item by item makes sense, in view of the President's request, in view of the urgent international crisis, and in view of the generally prevailing attitude in the country and in Congress in favor of economy.

If we consider the appropriation request item by item, the increase becomes even more surprising and astonishing. In the colloquy I had with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], it was brought out not only that there was an increase in General Research and Services from \$76 million in 1961 to \$140 million in the current request, an increase of about 85 percent, but that item by item increases were even greater.

In the National Heart Institute, for example, it was found that the item for medical research centers was to be in-

creased about 200 percent, according to the committee's recommendation. The item for the primate study was to be increased from \$7 million last year—and a \$7 million administration request this year—to \$15 million, an increase of substantially more than 100 percent.

Training grants, which the administration actually requested to have reduced, because after their study they apparently felt training grants should be reduced if the operation was going to be as efficient and effective as possible, would not be reduced under the administration's request, but increased from \$15 million to a level of \$21 million.

To summarize, the fact is we know there will be a deficit in the coming year. The President has told us that the deficit will be more than \$5 billion. On the basis of the performance of Congress to date, we can expect that deficit to be even larger.

In my judgment, never before has the country had a President who was better equipped or had more experience in this particular welfare field than President Kennedy. Welfare and health are the field in which he is perhaps more competent than any other. I do not think anyone can name an American President who has had more experience than has President Kennedy in this particular area. He understands the meaning of, and the necessity for, these programs, and he has made requests for substantial increases in the appropriations for them. But the Senate committee has simply gone beyond reason in recommending greatly increased appropriations for some of these areas.

So it seems to me that if we do believe in economy, if we really believe that we should reduce the Government's spending, at least in the domestic area, wherever that spending cannot be thoroughly justified, then the least we can do is to comply with the requests of our generous, warmhearted, and competent President in regard to the field in which he is most competent.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope these amendments will be adopted. On the question of agreeing to my amendments, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in a moment I shall speak on the pending business; but, first, I wish to discuss another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

#### U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on Sunday, July 30, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], was guest on the program "Issues and Answers" of the American Broadcasting Co.

The press reports of Senator FULBRIGHT's statements about Berlin mentioned a rift between the Senator from Arkansas and the administration over this issue, although nothing in the remarks attributed to the Senator from

Arkansas would bear out such a conclusion. I am always sorry to see stories of this kind contain more editorial conclusions than factual news.

I have read the transcript of the "Issues and Answers" program of Sunday. In it, Senator FULBRIGHT outlines some suggestions as to how this country might take the diplomatic offensive on the Berlin issue. Personally, I share the Senator's views that the lack of plans for a diplomatic offensive by the United States is a serious gap in this country's policy on Berlin. But it is a gap I think the administration is going to fill.

To point out its existence, as the Senator from Arkansas did on Sunday, and as I have, myself, on this floor, does not mean that either of us disagrees with what the administration has done so far about Berlin. Both of us are only suggesting that something more is required than the military preparations which have been ordered.

Much of the analysis of the American position on Berlin has stressed the fact that heretofore this country had but two alternatives: humiliating surrender, or nuclear war. Apparently the contribution made by General Taylor in his new post at the White House has been to urge the strengthening of our non-nuclear forces in Europe, so we shall have a military answer to the Russians other than all-out nuclear war.

I am not opposed to that addition to our military capacity. Throughout the period when massive retaliation was our only answer to every international difficulty, I opposed our reliance upon that single answer. We needed a greater variety of answers in the military field, and I endorse the steps the administration has taken to provide them.

Today's press carries a story of a speech that the Under Secretary of State, Chester Bowles, made yesterday at a meeting of American Foreign Service officers and Embassy heads. I take it for granted that the Under Secretary spoke in accordance with administration policy. I, for one, wish to endorse highly the speech made yesterday by the Under Secretary of State, if the press reports of the speech are accurate. Those press reports indicate that the administration is veering away from the John Foster Dulles program of massive retaliation, which I believe from the very beginning was an exceedingly unfortunate and unwise program on the part of our country.

I fear history will record that the massive retaliation proposal of John Foster Dulles proved to be very costly to the United States and to our foreign policy. I think it did much to frighten a good many millions of people in the world who otherwise would have supported the United States. It did much to increase the number of uncommitted and neutral nations in the world. Millions of people recognized that the massive retaliation policy of John Foster Dulles could not be reconciled with morality.

In fact, talk about a nuclear war cannot be reconciled with morality, either; and I wish to say that if we come to a nuclear war, it must be made very clear to history that we were forced into it

and were offered no alternative. Every possible alternative ought to be pursued, while at the same time we keep the military strength of this country so great that no combination of Communist forces in the world will ever have justification for thinking for a moment that they have anything to gain by carrying on an aggressive course of action against the United States, whether in Berlin or elsewhere in the world.

But all that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sought to put across was that we should pursue all the avenues of diplomatic alternatives available to us.

And so we should, Mr. President. Thus, to have the charge made that someone who proposes that the United States keep strong and at the same time pursue every avenue of diplomatic negotiation for settlement of the Berlin issue and any other issue in the world that threatens the peace, is an appeaser or is splitting with the administration, is simply an insult to intelligence. I do not think the intelligent American people are going to be misled by the kind of insult that some are so quick to utter, these days—namely, that if one speaks out for peace in the world, he is some kind of an appeaser.

Let me say that, in my judgment, in this critical hour millions of voices in America should be raised for peace. There is nothing inconsistent in urging the kind of approach that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee proposed on Sunday in the interest of peace, and at the same time urging that we keep our defenses so strong that Russia will always understand that she has everything to lose and nothing to gain by an aggressive course of action.

So I say we do need a greater variety of answers in the military field; and I endorse the steps the administration is taking in the military field to provide some variety.

But the military approach is not enough if we are going to win the peace, because if we make only a military approach, we are going to end up in a nuclear war.

As I said on this floor last week, the result of that nuclear war will be to leave Red China in control of the world. That nuclear war will knock out the Western Powers, including the United States and Russia, and the part of the world that will be left will be Red China, with growing nuclear power.

I think the Senator from Arkansas was trying to emphasize that we need some alternatives in the political, or diplomatic field, as well as in the military sense. Up to now, our political policy on Berlin has been one of saying "No" to everything and offering no political changes ourselves.

Now that this military gap is being filled, I hope the White House will give equal attention and thought to the political gap in our policy on Berlin. I believe this is what the Senator from Arkansas had in mind, too. To bring out this point does not indicate any opposition on the part of either of us to what has been done by the administration.

Speaking for myself, I support what the administration has done. I have also said, and repeat this afternoon on the floor of the Senate, the administration must go much further in the diplomatic field, in the negotiation field. It is very fortunate that, in his speech of last week, the President made perfectly clear his willingness to negotiate and adjudicate with regard to any treaty controversy which may be involved over Berlin, and he used the term "adjudicate."

The senior Senator from Oregon for some years has been pleading for the United States to at least make an attempt to get our adversaries to join us in an adjudication, under the United Nations Charter, of issues that threaten the peace of the world as a result of controversies over alleged treaty rights claimed by contending parties. That includes, of course, Berlin.

Mr. President, in order that the record made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] may be clarified completely, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the "Issues and Answers" program of July 30 printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ISSUES AND ANSWERS (Sunday, July 30, 1961)

Guest: Senator JAMES W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Panel: Peter Clapper, ABC Capitol Hill correspondent, and John Scali, ABC diplomatic correspondent.

The ANNOUNCER. From Washington, D.C., the American Broadcasting Co. brings you "Issues and Answers."

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, here are the issues.

Mr. CLAPPER. Will President Kennedy's program save Berlin for the West without a war?

Mr. SCALI. Are Khrushchev's Berlin threats a bluff or the real thing?

Mr. CLAPPER. Is President Kennedy providing strong enough leadership at home and abroad?

Mr. SCALI. Should we send troops to Cuba to get back the hijacked airliner?

The ANNOUNCER. You have heard the issues and now for the answers:

From Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas.

Here to explore the issues are ABC Capitol Hill correspondent, Peter Clapper, and with the first question, ABC's State Department correspondent, John Scali.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, do you share the view expressed by President Truman that Premier Khrushchev is bluffing over Berlin?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I have no basis at all to believe he is bluffing. I think he has a very serious situation in Berlin and he is determined to try to improve that situation one way or another. I do not believe he expects to precipitate a nuclear war over Berlin.

Mr. SCALI. You think this is Soviet-style brinksmanship?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Yes, I think every great nation indulges in this at times, but I think when you say "bluffing"—if President Truman means, does Mr. Khrushchev intend to attack with nuclear weapons—in that sense perhaps you could say he is bluffing. I don't think he intends to do that.

Mr. CLAPPER. Is he deceiving for some other operation somewhere else in the world, possibly?



Senator FULBRIGHT. In a sense that is involved. I see no signs of his relenting in his activities in other parts of the world. That is Latin America, or the Far East or Middle East; they are all connected.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, the President has called for \$3½ billion more in military spending. At the same time he has also said we are ready to negotiate. Are you satisfied with the military preparedness and do you think it strikes the right balance between negotiation and firmness?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think so. I thought his speech the other day was very well balanced and his request for military assistance has already been approved by the Senate, as you know. I think it is well balanced.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator, do you think the West should take the initiative in negotiations over Berlin?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I do. I think we have been remiss in not making proposals that would give some opportunity for negotiation. I think there are alternatives and I don't think we have been as aggressive in suggesting them as we should be.

Mr. CLAPPER. What are they?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well several have been explored and suggested in the past. One is for a different status with regard to the so-called middle Europe. The disengagement is one idea that could be discussed. The question of giving to West Germany any nuclear arms has been discussed. In the Potsdam Agreement, of course, we agreed, as I recall, not to rearm the West Germans. These are matters that could be brought up again. They have been discussed in the past and then dropped.

The question of a free city is a very difficult concept. I have read everything Khrushchev has said about it and I must say he doesn't go far enough in satisfying me that his idea of a free city is what I would think was a reasonable one.

Mr. CLAPPER. What about the MANSFIELD idea of a free city?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, the great problem here is whether or not you can make it satisfactory to us. I think MANSFIELD's suggestion was along the right line. I think we ought to discuss these alternatives. I am not saying that I think Khrushchev would agree to them. But I don't see any great advantage in just taking the view that we will entertain no negotiations, we won't enter into any negotiations for any kind of a change.

I think we ought to talk about it. I am not prepared to say just what kind of a change. I think Willy Brandt's suggestion that we have a peace conference with all 50 or 52 countries to discuss, not just Berlin, but the whole settlement of the war, including the status of the other Eastern European countries—what has been done there in accord with agreements and so on. This might clarify the air and might develop some alternative.

I think to continue to look just at the narrow question of Berlin may be not a very fruitful policy.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, you mentioned disengagement as a possibility. Could you go into that a little more? What do you have in mind?

Senator FULBRIGHT. This has been suggested and we rejected it, out of hand. I think there was a Rapaki plan, in which there would be a gradual drawing back of the troops. Our theory was that if Russia only drew back a little ways to her borders and it would mean our troops withdrawing all the way across the Atlantic. Well I don't know that that necessarily follows. At the moment they are very close to each other. These are matters which I think should be discussed. This caused great controversy when George Kennan proposed it, and I don't wish to stir up controversy or differences

either between me and the administration or within this country. There are already too many differences. What I am trying to say is that I think we should discuss matters related to the German question and have conferences about them especially at the ministerial level in an effort to seek to avoid a showdown leading to a nuclear war. That is what I am trying to say and I think any of these issues have possibilities of discussion. Now I know some of our very important people think that this is a futile and fruitless thing, that we should not—they interpret it as weakness. I do not so interpret it.

Mr. SCALI. Senator you said that Senator MANSFIELD's idea was along the right line. This idea of a free city, which would include all of Berlin.

Senator FULBRIGHT. A discussion of it at least and to see what kind of access.

I would not accept the idea that access to Berlin should be under the power and control of the East Germans. Now everything that Khrushchev has said would indicate he thinks that is part of it. Well I would not accept that. But we are not sure that this is the only thing he would entertain. If it was a genuine free city with completely free access, in which there was no doubt about it—guaranteed by everyone, I think there are possibilities in this direction and it ought to be discussed. I do not say that we ought to accept what he proposes. There is a big difference in this. But I believe in negotiation and discussion as opposed to ultimatums and showdowns as a general approach.

Mr. SCALI. Do you think we should take the initiative in proposing negotiations rather than wait for Khrushchev to sign his peace treaty?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Generally speaking for several years Khrushchev has made proposals, and we have said "No, we can't accept that, period." There are very few cases in which we have said, "Well, that might be interesting, but we believe this should be considered, and perhaps this should be considered, and we believe this could be reasonable." And there are other things that we could do, too, at the same time that are not related to a peace conference. If we are serious about this business, there are all kinds of trading activities going on between the East and the West that could be regulated. I have reference for example to a recent story in one of the newspapers about a new arrangement for the supplying of oil to India to supplant or to prevent and supplant the supply of oil by Russia. This is a very intelligent approach. This is the type of thing that should be going on. It shows some initiative and originality on our part and this is the sort of thing we should do which would strengthen and back up whatever negotiations we might get into with regard to Berlin. These things are all related.

Mr. CLAPPER. Getting back to the President's speech he called for our allies to do more in a military way both in the Berlin crisis and the long-range cold war toll. Do you think our allies response has been enough?

Senator FULBRIGHT. No, I do not, with regard to NATO in particular. They have not fulfilled their quotas and I think we have done more than our share in the past several years, largely because we were able to and they were in very difficult shape. The French have been diverted by Algeria. There are reasons for it. The Germans I think among all of them have not done as much as they are able and capable of doing in their own defense. I think they are the ones we should look to to carry a much greater part of this burden.

Mr. CLAPPER. What about the British? They are having economic troubles.

Senator FULBRIGHT. The British have very serious economic troubles at the moment. The only good thing about that is that it looks as if it is about to compel or con-

tribute to a decision to join the Common Market. I think this would be a good thing over the long term although it may have very serious repercussions in the near term for Great Britain.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator JAVITS among others has suggested a loan, through Congress, to Britain. How do you feel about that?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I would think the request ought to come from Britain first. I think it is a little premature to go about suggesting loans. I don't know that they need it. They have already indicated they are going to draw on the International Monetary Fund and that is what it is for. I would hope this is enough and I would not want to endorse such a loan.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, is it possible to improve Atlantic Pact defenses without asking our allies to reinstitute and in some cases lengthen the draft?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think this would be a very proper thing for them to do. I would think the main drive of the President's proposal is the strengthening of conventional methods of warfare and that would be an important step, as he suggested for our own program.

Mr. SCALI. Do you think the British should be exempted from being asked to spend significantly more for defense because of their financial problems at the moment?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, at the moment they are apparently in very difficult circumstances. This is particularly with regard to foreign trade, and this is why they indicated the troops in Germany were such a drain. This may not have the same problem at all with regard to their own manpower.

Mr. SCALI. Do you think the West Germans then should be called upon to pick up more of the tab?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I do. They did increase their contribution last year, but I think still they are the ones that are able among all of them to do more than they have done. We have been paying a very large amount, as you know, in our own troops. They refused even to consider contributing to the maintenance of our troops but they did make other concessions. I think they are still able to make more than they have.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator, today more Germans from East Germany crossed into West Berlin than at any time since the uprising in 1953. What is behind this and why don't the Communists stop it?

Senator FULBRIGHT. It is a very curious thing that they don't stop it. I am told many of these people are among the best trained technicians and skilled workmen in East Germany and that this has had a very grave effect upon their industry. The theory—we can only speculate about it—may be that in anticipation of closing the frontier this tremendous rush to get out is resulting. And I have heard it suggested that the Russians are quite willing for them to leave with the idea that they will fill their places with Russians; but I doubt this is a tenable theory because the Russians do not have a surplus population, they need their population in their own country. I confess it is a mystery that the East Germans don't stop the emigration of these people. I don't know why they don't.

Mr. SCALI. Do you know of any specific impact that this outflow of refugees has had on production in East Germany?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I was told by a well-informed person a short time ago that one of their aircraft factories had closed down because of the loss of so many of their technicians and it had crippled some other industries, I believe an automobile plant; that they had lost a very large number of the best technicians that they had in East Germany.

Mr. SCALI. In any negotiations over Berlin, Senator, would you be willing to accept any concessions on the part of the West which

closed West Berlin as an escape hatch for refugees in any way?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I think that that might certainly be a negotiable point. The truth of the matter is I think the Russians have the power to close it in any case. I mean we are not giving up very much because I believe next week if they chose to close their borders, they could, without violating any treaty right I know of. We have no right to insist that they be allowed to come out. As I said I don't understand why the East Germans don't close the border because I think they have a right to close it. So why is this a great concession? You don't have that right now.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator FULBRIGHT, what about a new summit meeting between Kennedy and Khrushchev? How do you feel about it?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I am not advocating summit meetings. I think they are very touchy things. Unless this develops much further along than now—it is immature to talk about a summit meeting now. We should never exclude that if negotiations at the diplomatic level lead up to the point where it looks as if there is something to agree upon, to discuss further. In this modern day it seems to be the fashion. I have a great prejudice against summit meetings as being dangerous and leading to—perhaps bringing friction to the higher level and making more dangerous the outbreak of war, but they have more or less become fashion, so maybe I have to accept them. But I think it is premature to talk about a summit meeting now.

Mr. SCALI. In line with the positive approach that you suggest toward negotiations, Senator, the idea has been made that perhaps one of the ways to settle this problem would be to move the United Nations headquarters to Berlin. What do you think of that?

Senator FULBRIGHT. That is a very imaginative one. I saw that in print. I don't know whether that is feasible or not. I know there are a lot of people who object to its being in New York. Most of them are people who don't like the U.N. at all and object to it.

You know one thing about this that bothers me is the idea that we cannot afford to talk and negotiate. This seems inconsistent with our whole philosophy of life, of politics, both national and international. When I think of all the talk that goes on here domestically, that this is a characteristic of a democratic system, it seems to me we ought to always encourage the quiet discussion of any differences in this field and I think it is too bad that anyone who suggests we discuss these problems is immediately said to be an appeaser, that you are getting ready to give up something or that you are going to compromise. It is going to be a Munich.

This seems quite inconsistent and wrong to take this attitude. We don't mean and I don't mean that we are going to give up anything. We are going to discuss it. Certainly we don't believe that this is the best possible solution to the European problem, to leave it as it is forever. I am frank to say I don't see much chance of an improvement but I always think we ought to discuss it.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator FULBRIGHT, the Communists have just published in the last day or two a new Communist manifesto designed to replace one that was published in 1919, I believe.

Now this shows a great hope for communism. They are claiming great things in the next 20 years. Do you think it is propaganda or are they serious?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, it has a little of both. You said 1919. They have been proceeding in the last few years on what they call 7-year plans. First it was 5, then it

was 7, and now it is 20. It is a program of development, as I understand it, not unlike the 5-year plan in India and so on. It is merely projecting what they hope to do and it serves both as an indication of their goals and I think some of those goals they will certainly realize.

They may not all of them—we usually set our goals a little higher than we expect to attain. We have done that—many people have done that. But I think it does have propaganda value and at the same time I wouldn't say that they don't expect to achieve a large part of it.

Mr. CLAPPER. We possibly do the same thing, a capitalistic manifesto to set up our ideas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think there are great differences between our two societies. There is a tendency to try to relate them closely, but really the basic value of our society is the individual's freedom. We believe if the individual is given an opportunity, that the ingenuity and energies of the individual released within the free society will out-produce a managed economy. I think their kind of a goal is a little inconsistent with our kind of a system if that is what you mean.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, if I may shift for a moment into your particular legislative arena, in the past few days you have engaged in a running debate with Senator GOLDWATER, whether in the nuclear age total victory is possible. This had led to some rather lively exchanges. How do you think you are doing in this debate?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Really it was just one exchange. I made a speech 3 or 4 weeks ago that had nothing whatever to do with, or mentioned Mr. GOLDWATER. I was rather flattered that he had read it. Apparently he did and he answered it himself, very critical of my speech, and I simply commented upon his.

I felt since he is recognized as one of the principal Republican spokesmen, that it was perhaps my duty—I don't try to answer everybody who disagrees with my views, but I thought I should in this instance and it was a very short answer. I thought his concept of a total victory is a quite unrealistic and meaningless phrase and that it misleads people in these days and I don't want to repeat what I said, I didn't think you wanted me to, but I thought that he tends to oversimplify very complicated questions and it leaves, I think, in the minds of many people some false impressions as to the kind of world we are in and I don't think this is very healthy to the development of sound policies.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator, Senator GOLDWATER has called the Kennedy foreign policy weak-kneed. And you yourself have called for stronger Presidential leadership. What is the difference?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I don't agree with Mr. GOLDWATER as to its being weak-kneed. I think that is another example of the highly oversimplified description of this situation. President Kennedy inherited a very bad situation, as we know. He inherited the situation in Cuba and in Laos, both of them extremely embarrassing and difficult for this country and I think he has done very well, except in Cuba. I thought it was a mistake. I think he acknowledges that the effort was a mistake. Either it should have been done strong enough to succeed or it shouldn't have been done at all. I happen to believe it shouldn't have been done at all, for reasons much too complicated to go into here. I thought it was a mistake to do that. Nevertheless that is neither here nor there. I think he has done very well and kept his head and he has spoken with restraint and I think this is what is called for.

It is very easy to stir up a war. It takes no brains and no skill to stir any country

up into a warlike spirit and you can go to war, as countries have done throughout history.

The people appreciate very little the man who tries to avoid these things and they are constantly criticized for appearing to be weak and compromising and so on, but this is the thing that I value most in the President, that he has evidenced caution and that he has shown a desire to avoid a showdown and a war, because I don't believe any of us are going to profit by a nuclear war.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, speaking of Cuba, what do you think of the demands made by some Senators that we should use military force to go in to get the highjacked Eastern Air Liner from Cuba, if necessary?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well I know that is a very provocative act that they did. There are one or two things I don't know about it. In the first place, this morning's paper would indicate this man may not have been authorized to do it at all by Cuba, that he was a freelancer who thought this was a great stunt and that he would gain credit in Cuba. He was a nationalized citizen of this country.

Mr. SCALI. Well, the Cubans still haven't returned the plane.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, it was a sort of windfall for them and it is a propaganda element. They can't use the plane I am told because they don't have the machinery that is necessary to start it but it is something to talk about.

I would hesitate to say offhand that we should not do anything there. I think it would be very drastic to go to war over that plane. We have 10 planes that our private citizens have attached for private bills. Perhaps we could work out something. That is a complicated matter. It is a little bit like the tractors deal. I don't think it is worth going to war about.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, Under Secretary Bowles has suggested that the way to handle Castro is to concentrate on aiding other Latin American countries with their development programs and letting Mr. Castro wither away and die on the vine. Would you agree with this approach?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think, generally speaking, it is a right policy. Mr. Castro is very irritating and embarrassing, but we ourselves have much to blame ourselves for over the past 50 years. We had Cuba. We could have guided it in nearly any direction. We neglected our opportunity when we had the opportunity to do with Cuba, proper things. It is embarrassing. I do not think that it would be any great achievement for a country of 180 million people to go down and knock off this fellow. After it is done what have you done? What have you accomplished and how have you contributed, other than to have removed a little embarrassment? I don't think I would do that, and I think what you say is correct, that we must concentrate on the rest of Latin America, and if it succeeds he will be isolated.

Mr. CLAPPER. You were critical of the Cuban invasion of the island. Are you satisfied that there is no behind-the-scenes effort to try it again?

Senator FULBRIGHT. To my knowledge there is not. I know of these groups. There is a big ad in this morning's paper that would indicate they are seeking groups of Cubans to drum up enthusiasm and support for this, but I assume you mean by our Government.

Mr. CLAPPER. Yes.

Senator FULBRIGHT. I know of no such plans.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, one of the things that seems to have aroused the suspicions of the Republicans is an alleged plan to give diplomatic recognition to Communist China and to favor its admittance to the U.N., and that plus whatever plans are underway for



recognition of Communist Outer Mongolia. Do you see any reason for such suspicion?

Senator FULBRIGHT. No. I think in this case we as a country are prisoners of our past mistakes, if you like. The sentiments of this country have been developed to such a pitch our President has no freedom of action in this field. Our Senate just passed unanimously a resolution supporting the view of nonrecognition of Red China, which it has done, I do not know, 15 or 20 times. It has become a ritual, a Republican ritual. This stems from the old days of McCarthy in which they thought—the Republicans believed, and maybe with reason, that they were succeeding in proving that the Democrats were soft on communism and this is a hangover from those days and these very difficult taboos or whatever they are, voodoo, voodooism, or prejudices or whatever you want to call them, to overcome, so we go through this ritual every year, repeating this thing. And, of course, nobody in public life can be in favor of recognition of China.

And also Mr. Chiang Kai-shek is involved in this and we more or less take our orders from him in this field. When he objects we have always been very good about going along with it.

I guess this is the proper policy. I am not objecting to it. He is important in that area and we consult with him as we do in other places. And I don't think we are going to recognize Red China. I do not favor it at this time. I don't know anybody who does.

I rather get tired of this repetition of this kind of resolution. Who is to say we should? Yet we are forced to put another resolution through. I haven't said we should. Nobody said we should.

Mr. CLAPPER. Will we recognize Outer Mongolia?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I doubt it—for much the same reason. I think much could be said for doing it, on the ground of information, of knowing what is going on in that area, or being able perhaps to contribute to the differences between China and Russia. But for the same reason that we will not recognize Red China, because of the price of dissension within our own ranks at home; it is too great to pay. I don't know whether it was wise or not. I don't know enough about Outer Mongolia. But the reasons that have been given by those who purport to know would indicate that we might learn something of value to us. But I think we have no freedom of action in this field because of domestic politics.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator, turning to domestic politics, there is some word now that perhaps the foreign-aid bill will not offer 5-year loans, but just 3. Would this be an acceptable compromise to you?

Senator FULBRIGHT. No, not to me. I am for 5 years. When you say "acceptable," if the Senate votes it, what do I do, jump off a bridge? Of course you accept it. I am against it but I think it would be very foolish to do it and I shall not vote for it.

Mr. SCALI. Is there a compromise being arranged—

Mr. CLAPPER. Excuse me. I am sorry. I have to interrupt, here. Our time is up.

Thank you Senator FULBRIGHT for being with us today on "Issues and Answers."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, now I wish to say a word about the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He was subjected to attack here on the floor of the Senate the other day in the colloquy, and the RECORD speaks for itself; but as a member of the committee, I rise as his witness.

In my judgment, not only the Senate, but the American people, are exceedingly fortunate to have a man with the keen intellect, depth of perception, knowledge of history, and understand-

ing of foreign policy issues that confront, not only this country, but mankind, in the person of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

I want the RECORD to show this afternoon my complete confidence in the leadership of the Senator from Arkansas as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I speak most respectfully when I say to the State Department and the White House, "You will do well to heed and counsel with this student and statesman in the field of foreign policy." As a matter of fact, the White House and State Department have been doing it and, in my judgment, it has been to the benefit of the White House and the State Department and the country.

I do not always agree with every proposal of the Senator from Arkansas; and when I do not, probably he is right. Perhaps sometimes I may be right, and he wrong, in a disagreement. But we are being served by a chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee who is dedicated—I repeat, dedicated—to the great cause that confronts the United States and mankind—namely, winning a safe and permanent peace without, to any degree whatsoever, sacrificing the interests of the United States.

I wanted to say these things today about the chairman of the committee, and to say them in his absence from the floor, because I have been reading some of the comments, and unfair stories, that have been published about the Senator from Arkansas. I wish the RECORD to show this afternoon that, having served under his tutelage and leadership on the Foreign Relations Committee, I have complete confidence in his leadership and complete approval of the high order of his statesmanship.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to the subject matter before the Senate. To my friend from Wisconsin I wish to say that I usually find myself in agreement with him in regard to needed cutbacks in an appropriation bill. It is with a heavy heart that I tell him I have to leave him on this one, because I do not believe the committee has brought to the Senate, in a committee report, a recommendation of too high an appropriation in the whole field of health. To the contrary, I do not think the committee has gone far enough.

I have made some study of the hearings, and I think the Senator from Alabama will testify in support of the observation I now make. The committee had before it representatives of professional advisory committees in the field of health representing a cross section, I think, of the various centers, research groups, medical schools, and research authorities in this country. They recommended sums far in excess of the sums being recommended by the committee.

I will ask the Senator from Alabama if that is not true.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. The truth is that for the medical research program they recommended an increase of \$335 million. The Appropriations Committee reported an increase of \$195 million, in round figures.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I share his high regard for the President of the United States. The President of the United States, when he was a Senator from Massachusetts, served on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have been a member for some years, under the very able leadership of the Senator from Alabama, who is chairman of the committee and is also chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which reported the bill now before the Senate. There is no question of the keen interest of the Senator from Massachusetts had in this whole field when he served on the committee. I certainly agree that the President of the United States, based on his Senate experience, and other experiences, is a well-informed man in this field—but not infallible.

Also I wish to say, most respectfully, that the President of the United States submitted his budget request in advance of the hearings which the Senate committee conducted on this subject matter. The President of the United States did not have the advantage of the documented evidence that the authorities in the field of health submitted to the Senate committee. Therefore, I cannot reach the conclusion which the Senator from Wisconsin reaches, if I am correct in my assumption that it is his conclusion, that the budget's recommendation would have been the same if he had had the same benefit of the enlightening information which the expert witnesses presented to the subcommittee of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The Senator from Wisconsin loses me in the force of the argument he makes by saying, "We ought to back the President because this is the President's recommendation." I only say, "This is the President's recommendation before the fact. This is the President's recommendation before the record was made. This is the President's recommendation before the committee had the benefit of this body of very valuable information, on the basis of which the committee has made its final recommendation."

I say to my friend from Alabama: I know the problem which confronted him in the committee, exactly as I appreciate the problem which confronted the President when he presented his budget to the Congress. Imagine all the demands for appropriations. Imagine all the good causes which were presented at the so-called executive level in the development of the Presidential budget. Not even a Solomon could really be sure of his wisdom in the decisions and recommendations the President has to make in his final submission of a budget to the Congress.

I stress the fact that the President did not have the benefit, at the budgetary stage, of the documented evidence

the Senator from Alabama and his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee had.

Furthermore, I am not going to be persuaded by an argument that I ought to follow the President because this is the President's recommendation, because my responsibility as a Senator is quite different from that of the President. My responsibility as a Senator is a legislative responsibility. As a legislator, I have to take a look at the evidence which is presented in support of proposed legislation. I have to decide as a Senator as to whether the weight of the evidence supports X recommendation or Y recommendation. If I think it does, I ought to be bound by that evidence, and not by an opinion recommendation a President submitted in a budget message at a time he did not have before him the evidence which I as a legislator have been called upon to evaluate and to make a decision based upon. So I have never in my 17 years in the Senate been persuaded very much by the argument that I ought to do something because it is a Presidential recommendation. Rather, I ask myself the question, when each legislative issue is before me, "What does the evidence show?"

As a Senator it is my duty to evaluate the evidence and to vote in accordance with what I believe will best promote the public interest. Under our system of the separation of powers and checks and balances, if the President thinks the Congress goes too far awry then he has a constitutional obligation to veto what we do. I am perfectly willing to always meet that action on the part of the President.

I cannot speak for the President. I do not know what the President's position will be if we vote for this committee recommendation and the House in conference agrees to a sum very close to this figure. That is the concern of the President, not of mine. I will pass judgment upon what course of action he may follow if it comes back to me for further senatorial action.

What I am satisfied about is that the committee has not gone far enough. That is why I cannot support my good friend from Wisconsin in his amendments to cut back in this whole field of health. I wish to say a few words about the need from the standpoint of public interest and from the standpoint of national defense in connection with appropriations for health.

Mr. President, it is very easy to say, in the course of debate, when one feels rather deeply about some subject before the Senate, "This is more important than anything else," or "This is more important than something else." I try to avoid that error in logic. I think it usually is an error in logic.

I wish to put it this way: I do not think anybody can successfully refute the fact that the health needs of the American people are sorely in need of greater attention by the Congress of the United States. I think we in the Congress for many years have been most inadequate in appropriating the minimum amounts of money which ought to be appropriated to seek to relieve suffering humanity in the United States and else-

where in the world, for that matter, from the scourges of diseases which take such a heavy toll day after day and year after year.

Therefore, for some reason I cannot get very much concerned about a proposal to cut back on health research. I cannot find myself filled with very much enthusiasm about a proposal to accept a budget estimate in regard to appropriations for heart disease or cancer research, or with respect to any of the other terrible tolltakers of human life. I would rather err in the other direction. I would rather appropriate more than can be used, with some check in the appropriation to provide for a reversion in case the money cannot be used efficiently and effectively.

I wish to mention one small item. My colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] has commented upon, in connection with proposed legislation, air pollution in the United States, the matter of gases which are filling the atmosphere particularly of our cities, apparently, so the scientists say, as a result of heavy motor vehicle traffic. There is not only the assumption but also now a body of scientific data being collected which gives cause to believe there is a direct cause-to-effect relationship between air pollution and cancer. We had better find out. One thing we know is that the incidence of cancer is increasing. We know that lung cancer incidence is climbing.

The Senator from Alabama and I certainly are not medical authorities, but I think we have a legislative responsibility to do everything that we can to get every last dollar which can be efficiently and effectively spent in regard to research in connection with the question of whether or not there is a cause-to-effect relationship between air pollution and lung cancer and other forms of cancer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator of course knows there is no cancer which progresses more rapidly or is more fatal or deadly than lung cancer.

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. HILL. While the Senator speaks about lungs and respiratory disease, of course the Senator has noted the tremendous increase in the disease known as emphysema. We have no cure for that disease. It is a terrible disease, as a result of which the cells in the lungs break down, and the broken-down cells fill up with water moisture, which makes it impossible for the oxygen to get into the blood stream of the body, and the patient does not live long.

Mr. MORSE. I do not care where the surface of need for medical research is scratched. What do our doctor friends tell us? We think we know a great deal, but we know that the depth of our ignorance is abysmal compared with even the very little knowledge that we have yet developed in regard to medical science. We are proud of the progress that the medical profession has made. But let them be their own witnesses. They say, "We look down in the abyss of our

ignorance into the depths of what we do not know."

We talk about economizing. I do not question the sincerity and the high motives of my friend from Wisconsin in connection with his amendments, but I do not agree with him on the merits. So we have, respectfully, a difference of opinion on the amendments. From the standpoint of defense and strengthening the security of the country, we cannot justify economizing on medical research. We ought to have a crash program on medical research. I do not know of any jury of scientists, medical authorities, doctors, or biochemists who have any familiarity at all with the effects of radiation, who would not come before us today and testify, "If we know anything, it is just about that little amount, figuratively speaking"—and I hold my thumb and forefinger about a quarter of an inch apart—"in comparison with the depth of the lack of knowledge that we have in the field of medical science in respect to radiation and its effect on the human organism."

I do not think this is a time to be cutting back on research in the whole field of medicine. I am not critical of the committee of which the Senator from Alabama is chairman, but I wish that the committee had given us a recommendation for more, not less, appropriations in this particular field from the standpoint of defense. I do not know of any greater defense weapon that we could possibly have than the maximum potential health of our people.

What better defense could we have than a population which is as healthy as medical science can make possible?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have listened with intense interest to the informed and persuasive remarks of the Senator from Oregon. In essence I believe he has said that research in the field of medicine, as in many other fields, is an investment rather than an expenditure.

Mr. MORSE. That is a good way of putting it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We invest the original dollar but, in the long run, we receive a dividend which far exceeds the expenditure. Such benefits may not be realized for a generation hence, but it is very timely that our colleague speaks to us as he does today in this Chamber.

I offer an illustration, which though tangential to the primary issue addressed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], is not inappropriate. I would not disparage the occupation or profession of any person, and certainly not that of individuals who have a flair for singing rock-and-roll songs. Such music has an appeal for certain groups of our population, the teenager and presumably some adults.

Among the leading entertainers in this field, I am told, is Johnny Mathis, who was paid \$15,000 a week to sing at a night club on the outskirts of Pittsburgh.

Also in that same city, Mr. President, lived Dr. Jonas Salk, the developer of the polio vaccine which has saved the



health and lives of countless thousands of persons throughout the world. Dr. Salk worked long hours in the laboratories of the University of Pittsburgh for not \$15,000 a week, but \$15,000 a year.

It is no disparagement to the person or behavior of Johnny Mathis to observe that his contributions to society are hardly to be weighed in the same balance with those of Dr. Salk. We had better find a new perspective toward our values, and I congratulate the Senator from Oregon for his contribution in that respect.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from West Virginia very much. I am about through speaking on this point. I wish to move to another subject and emphasize once more that I think that the item is a good defense appropriation. I believe it is a good national security appropriation. I do not think we ought to cut back on the appropriation because we may have to make additional appropriations for military defense. I am frank to say that I believe the item is important for military defense. It has relation to another problem. I close this part of my speech with a brief reference to it.

I think there is growing recognition—and I think people will recognize it more year by year—that the health of our people is the concern of all our people. All our people have the right to look to our Government to be of assistance in promoting the health of all of our people.

For example, as is well known, I am a strong supporter of social security for medical assistance to the aged. I am satisfied that the American Medical Association will not be able to stop it for many years, because gradually the American people are being heard from, and gradually the American people will make clear to their politicians that they had better get busy and pass some legislation and have the Federal Government assume its responsibility in this field. The American people are not fooled by the false charge of the American Medical Association that such action will lead to socialization, because they know very well it will do no such thing. The private practitioner would continue to practice medicine on aged people. But the Federal Government, through the social security and insurance system, sees to it that the fees will be available for the doctor for the services rendered, and that he will not be allowed to exercise the discretionary power of a form of taxation on his own part, but that the Federal Government will say, "This service will be rendered, the fees will be paid, and the people will build up an insurance bank for the payment of those fees."

The point to which I speak is related directly to the problem before us today, because as I see it, it is only one facet of the responsibility on the part of the Federal Government to proceed with the appropriations necessary to continue research work so that the doctors can properly serve their patients. I am always a little amused when doctors talk about the private practice of medicine anyway. They forget that for the most part their tools, knowledge, and scientific

information upon which they serve their clients have been developed through such programs as those about which we are talking today. They are truly practitioners. Much of the research has not been done by the practicing doctor himself. I do not for one moment seek to detract in the slightest degree from the great humanitarian service of the medical profession. But there is an administrative problem—the governmental problem—separate and distinct from the practice of medicine itself. There is a responsibility on the part of the Government, through such programs as the one before us and others that I believe will be enacted within a few years, to see to it that the health of the American people receives maximum protection through such Government assistance as the Government is able to supply.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, one of my predecessors in the Senate, who voluntarily retired from the Senate after serving only a few months, once pointed out to me that during his brief service in the Senate he noticed an amendment to reduce the funds for cancer research. That man is still alive today. He pointed out to me that of those Senators who had voted to cut the funds for cancer research, five had died of cancer since that vote had occurred.

I do not point that out in any way to question the judgment of the Senators who voted against research to find the cure for cancer. I do make the point that those men, as well as everyone else in this Nation, would perhaps have benefited from the Nation acquiring the answer to the dread disease of cancer at an earlier date, instead of waiting for many years when untold thousands, and perhaps tens of thousands, would have died needlessly while we were looking for a medicine which today we do not know how to produce.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, because his illustration helps support the major point that I am seeking to make here on the floor of the Senate. It is a clear obligation on the part of Congress to appropriate these funds as a matter of service that the American people have the right to expect from their Government. We have the know-how, so these experts testify. We need the funds to carry on the experimentation, so we can bring the relief to suffering humanity that these experiments could bring.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I know the Senator is not directing himself to this particular issue at this moment, but I would like to raise this point because to me it is very important. In the field of cancer research, those who are today using these public funds are permitting a single contractor to have the patent rights, to the point where he will be in position to monopolize, to the exclusion of all others, and even, if he chooses to do so, the point of barring the public from the benefit of the cure although it is to be arrived at with public funds.

In my judgment that is the most extreme case of public expenditure for private profit, when an agency spending U.S. Government money takes the money of all the people and gives it to a single contractor on a basis where the contractor is placed in the position of being able to charge the public a fantastically high price for something achieved at public expense.

Thank the merciful Lord that we did not do that when penicillin was discovered. Fortunately it was done under contract by the Department of Agriculture, which was not looking for penicillin for human consumption at the time it was discovered. Sometimes it happens that in research something is found that is not the purpose at all of the original research.

The Department of Agriculture is required by law to see to it that there are no private patent monopolies to the exclusion of other competitors when it does research. Therefore, when penicillin was discovered, everybody could compete by Government permit—and, of course, the Government was required to license everyone on a nondiscriminatory basis—in producing penicillin. In that way the cost of penicillin is about 5 percent of what the cost was when that product first came out. If the procedure of letting a private patent be taken out on that medicine had been permitted, in the same way that it is being done in the field of cancer today, it would have been possible for the one company holding the patent, a patent arrived at taxpayers' expense, to have charged 50 to 100 times the fair price for that product.

Mr. MORSE. I could not possibly agree more with the Senator from Louisiana. I shall support any amendment that he offers at any time in the Senate which seeks to prevent just that kind of what I consider to be exploiting the American people in the whole field of health, to which he has referred.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that under the rule I cannot offer the amendment now.

Mr. MORSE. Not now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I could not let this chance pass, on hearing the Senator's eloquent speech, without making this point for the edification of those who may hear or read it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator cannot offer such an amendment to the pending bill. However, I want the Senator to know that I think we ought to initiate a bill, for appropriate reference to a legislative committee, which will seek to give the American people the protection to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Such a bill is before the Committee on the Judiciary. I hope the committee will give us a chance to act on it in this Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have one other point to make, and then I shall ask the attention of the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Wisconsin to a procedural matter.

The last argument I wish to make on the amendment is that I have a suggestion for a saving. I make the suggestion as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I make it as one

who is going to support the main framework of the foreign aid bill. I wish to say that in my judgment there is a great deal of water in the foreign aid bill which can be squeezed out of it, and still leave a bill of great substance.

I certainly do not think we can justify passing a foreign aid bill with the amount of money that is contained in that bill, if at the same time it is argued that we ought to cut back on the program for medical health research in the United States. In my judgment, there are hundreds of millions of dollars that can be taken out of the foreign aid bill if we must cut back. I am not saying that that money cannot be put to good use, although I do not ignore the fact that a great deal of money similarly appropriated in the past was not put to good use. If there is anything that our hearings on the foreign aid bill have brought out, it is that there have been some unwise expenditures made in the past, and that there has been a great deal of waste in the past. We would be disillusioning ourselves if we believed that waste will automatically vanish with a new bill. There will still be a great deal of it. I recognize the fact, however, that we must go forward with a foreign aid bill.

The point I wish to make is that I will not be persuaded by the argument that we ought to cut back on a program that is as important as medical research in the United States, on the ground of economy, and then proceed with any such amount as we have included in the foreign aid bill.

Furthermore, let me point out that we can cut back on the foreign aid bill and add to the pending bill and do more foreign aid good than we will in some parts of the foreign aid bill. Let us not forget that when we spend money for medical research and for health programs in the United States, we help health all around the world. Findings with regard to medical research do not stop at the water's edge. They are transportable. They are exportable. They will be made available to the medical profession all over the world. I do not find myself in any way being persuaded by any economy argument in connection with the appropriation bill now before the Senate. To the contrary, I believe we could add money to the recommendation of the Senator from Alabama in this field, and cut a corresponding amount of money from the foreign aid bill in many places, and at the same time do more foreign aid good by that kind of transfer of funds than if we were to cut money out of the pending bill and not touch the amount in the foreign aid bill.

That is the burden of my argument against the amendment of my good friend from Wisconsin. I shall not be surprised if before we get through with appropriation bills the Senator from Wisconsin and I will be back on the same team, agreeing to make some economies in some other bills, and that I will agree with him that in connection with those bills we can make cuts without doing damage to the public interest. However, at this time we part company.

Now I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Wisconsin.

I have another matter to present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I assure the Senator from Oregon that he has been making such a timely, such an able, such an excellent speech that he has had my attention all the way.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is always generous and kind. He has demonstrated to us his wonderful human quality, which explains perhaps as much as anything else why he is unbeatable.

Now I wish to raise a procedural question. I have another subject I wish to discuss this afternoon at some length. At the same time, I wish to accommodate myself to the wishes of the proponent of the amendment and of the chairman of the subcommittee. As the Senator from Alabama surmises, I shall have something to say later this afternoon on the whole subject of vocational rehabilitation.

I have a series of questions I shall propound to the Senator from Alabama. I may have an amendment to offer, unless we succeed in making a legislative record which will make the amendment unnecessary.

I have the floor now. I could continue and bring this other matter up. However, I think that to do so would be somewhat out of order at this time. I wonder if it would be preferable to the Senator from Alabama if I postponed until later this afternoon or this evening or tomorrow my discussion of the problem of vocational rehabilitation and let the Senator from Wisconsin proceed with the disposal of his amendment.

Mr. HILL. It would be perfectly agreeable to the Senator from Alabama to proceed in that way.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Wisconsin prefer to have me postpone my discussion of the vocational rehabilitation problem until later?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would appreciate it if the Senator would do so. I have about concluded. There may be one or two other Senators who wish to speak on the subject.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I announce that I shall discuss the problem of vocational rehabilitation later. It will take a half hour to do so. Until I have made that statement, I would not wish to enter into an agreement to limit debate on the bill. I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I sympathize with the Senator from Wisconsin in his efforts to effectuate economy in government. We all seek to do that. In fact, the subcommittee of which the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama is the chairman has spent many weeks looking for ways to economize.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, in searching for economy, has let his hand fall heavily on the parts of the bill which concerned our subcommittee most; namely, those parts which

seek solutions to the cloudy mystery of why people die from diseases such as cancer and arthritis, or from heart conditions, and to try to expedite human discovery and provide facilities to do something about those diseases.

Out of the \$297 million which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin seeks to cut from the bill, he has chosen \$277 million for items which are directly related to relief of human suffering and finding the cause of the catastrophic diseases which have visited mankind since time began. These are the activities which would feel the impact of most of the reduction proposed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

When I say we are all looking for economy, I call attention to the fact that 60 other items of the bill have either been reduced or held to the budget amount. Out of 60 items in other parts of the bill, with the exception of health items, 18 were reduced substantially by the subcommittee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama. Out of those 60 items, there are increases in only 7. Eight reductions were below the budget amounts.

Yes, the distinguished Senator from Alabama has gone over the budget and has considered the actual health needs of the Nation. Certainly the Hill-Burton Act has been the greatest boon to the practice of medicine and to the bringing of modern medicine to the crossroad towns of Wisconsin. Under the Hill-Burton Act, the great hospital aid program, the Federal Government matches the funds which the local community can raise. Those hospitals are modern and have up-to-date laboratories. It has been possible to attract new graduates from the University of Oklahoma Medical School and the great school of medicine at the University of Wisconsin to the smaller communities, where they could not be found a few years ago, because they did not have the facilities with which to work. Yet the Senator from Wisconsin proposes to cut \$25 million out of the hospital program, does he not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that I do not propose to cut any of these programs. My amendment would permit an increase in virtually every one of the health programs—in many cases, a substantial increase. In one important instance, there would be a 25-percent increase for general research services over the amount for 1961. The amount for the Heart Institute, \$86 million, would rise to \$97 million. These are big increases.

I have no desire to reduce the amounts for these programs. They are all increased.

What I am seeking to do is to conform with the generous request of the Kennedy administration, which was very deeply concerned, and properly so, with health, and has increased, right along the line, virtually every health program over the amount of the 1961 appropriations.



Mr. MONRONEY. I heard the Senator's cogent argument that we should stay within the budget. One would almost think the budget message was another Sermon on the Mount. I, too, thought it was important. But why do we waste time in the Committee on Appropriations, going over the budget line by line, bringing forward outstanding experts who have made breakthroughs in the study of arthritis and heart disease, if we are expected to rubber stamp the budget requests? Are we to be bound by the top limits of the budget, and dare we not trespass, no matter how much more information we hear from the leading medical authorities of the Nation, as to the needs and the capabilities for research, and the importance of accelerating research in certain diseases, actually to find the answer to the very serious diseases? If we are to be bound by the budget estimates, why does not the Senator, if he wishes to be consistent, move to reinstate the vast amount of reductions which the committee has made?

Actually, while the Senator from Wisconsin is trying to cut \$297 million from the bill, he will find that half of the amount he is seeking to cut out has been offset by the subcommittee by reductions made below the budget.

Are we going to be a Congress and realize that the power given to Congress over the purse is power to examine carefully the appropriation requests? Or shall we say there is no need for this power which the Constitution gives us, and accept as sacrosanct the allotments which we have cut?

I want to know where the consistency is. Was the President's budget correct as to the items which the committee reduced? If it was, then let us move to increase them. Was it right on the items having a direct bearing on health? One of the greatest authorities on medical research in the world today, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], has listened by the hour and by the day to the foremost authorities in order to make that decision.

I respect the President highly. I respect his budget. As a matter of fact, even in the health items, there are 13 items on which the committee has followed the budget.

President Kennedy was sworn in on January 20. This budget was sent to Congress late in January. I do not believe that President Kennedy could possibly have been informed in the same degree as the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama has informed himself, after long hearings this year, as well as last year and the year before.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is a member of the subcommittee which heard the testimony and wrote the recommendations which were concurred in by the full committee. The Senator from Oklahoma has been one of the most understanding Members of this body. He is aware of the effect the bill will have on our economy, more particularly and most important at this time, its relationship to the physical strength and capabili-

ties of our boys and young men, and also with respect to what the bill means to our national defense. The Senator from Oklahoma will bear witness to the fact that the subcommittee sat for hours and days listening to the distinguished witnesses tell the story of the compulsion and need for these programs.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is absolutely correct; and he knows that if such meat-axe cuts are made in the amounts recommended by the committee, tens of thousands of our people who might be saved will die in misery and torture, whereas if we accelerate this program we shall have a chance to move forward much faster. Each year that I have served on this committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama has been providing leadership in connection with the provision of more funds than the Budget Bureau requested for these programs, and each year the administration and the Bureau of the Budget have recommended for the following year the amounts the committee voted for the preceding year. Yet we have been told that it is impossible to use the amounts which have been provided.

If the Senator from Wisconsin can point out waste or extravagance in connection with these amounts, I hope he will propose reductions in them; and in that event, I will vote with him. But I cannot in good conscience say that when the States are providing \$400 million with which to back up the hospital aid program, we are being wasteful by voting to increase the amount of the budget estimate. For instance, in my own State there are hospitals which today are serving great needs, at locations where no hospitals previously existed; and I am sure a similar situation exists today in Wisconsin.

For instance, the committee has added \$4,825,000 for mental health. The testimony submitted to our committee was that for the first time in our history the case load of the mental hospitals is decreasing, rather than increasing. Are we gaining? I think we are.

In trying to save money this year, the Senator from Wisconsin would, if he were successful in making such cuts, merely add to the mental torture of those who must be hospitalized, and who during the years of our blindness to the proper approach to the problems of mental health have had nothing to look forward to except padded cells or barred windows. But today progress is being made.

These two items, as I understand, would be reduced by the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin, if they were agreed to. One of the items is for St. Elizabeths Hospital and similar institutions. Are they important? Of course, they are.

Another one of the items for which the appropriation would be reduced by the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin is Gallaudet College, the great college for the deaf, the only college which provides teaching for the deaf. The bill as reported by our committee will provide funds to improve the facilities for the teaching of those who are deaf.

This item of the bill will help provide better facilities for those who give their lives to aiding the deaf and to helping them lead useful lives.

Then we come to the item for the only university in the United States that has an open door of welcome for young Negroes who wish to obtain college educations. This university is of vital importance. Our committee voted to increase the amount of the budget estimate for its appropriation. We voted an increase of \$1,517,000 in the item for the expenses of operation and the salaries of the teachers. I think that increase is justified. I think we need to bring to Howard University as fine a faculty as can be found in any of the other colleges of the United States. We should also bear in mind that Howard University is not a segregated university; it offers to accept both white and colored students, alike. We have added \$3 million for the construction of buildings, to provide a total of \$4,612,000 over the amount of the budget estimates.

I am glad the committee considered the importance of providing excellent training to all manner of men; and I think we can justify the committee's report on the bill, because, as I have said, cuts have been made in less essential items, with the result that reductions have been made in the budget estimates in 18 cases, and in 42 cases the amounts recommended by the Senate committee are at the level of the amounts of the budget estimates; and in only 7 instances, up to this point in the bill, has the Senate committee recommended increased amounts—until we come to the items for health and our institutions of health. Since our committee has been able to make reductions which total approximately half of the amounts the committee has added to the items for the health institutes, by making reductions in the amounts for the mundane, every day, bureaucratic expenditures, the committee should not be penalized by having the reductions now proposed made in the items for the very valuable medical research work, for which the committee has recommended increases in the amounts of the budget estimates. Credit should at least be given for the savings the committee has been able to make by proposing reductions in the amounts of items for the Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. First, I wish strongly to commend the Senator from Oklahoma for the very fine statement he has made. It is most timely, most persuasive, and most informative.

The Senator from Oklahoma spoke about our progress in the field of mental health. We can take great pride and gratification in the fact that we have made that progress. From the time when the first hospital for the mentally ill—those who in the old days were called insane—was established at Williamsburg, Va., many years ago, until 5 years ago there was a constant increase in the number of hospitals for the mentally ill. Every year there have been more and

more. Even today, more than one-half of the hospital beds in the United States are occupied by persons who are suffering from some form of mental illness. But great progress has been made. For instance, at the end of 1960 there were approximately 535,000 patients in our State mental hospitals, and that was a significant reduction of more than 23,000 patients, during the 5 years to which I have referred. In other words, we finally have reached a point where we have been making some reduction in the numbers, rather than to have increases come year after year after year.

But although we can take pride in these programs, which the Senator from Oklahoma has so strongly supported and which our Senate committee has so strongly supported, we still have a very, very serious situation in the field of mental health.

The Senator from Oklahoma will recall that in 1955 the Congress established a Joint Commission on Mental Health. It was composed of some of the most distinguished men in that field—doctors, psychiatrists, and biological scientists. The Director of the Commission was Dr. Ewalt, who is mental health director of the great State of Massachusetts. The Joint Commission made its report about March of this year. In its report the Commission had this to say:

By comparison with polio we are not even at the 1908 stage in the sense of having discovered causes \* \* \* the enormous patient-care task the mental health profession faces today is matched only by the enormous research lag in the study of human behavior.

When this budget estimate was made up—and I refer now to the very eloquent statement the Senator from Oklahoma has made on this point—those who made up the budget estimate did not have the benefit of the study and the report made by the Mental Health Commission. But we who sat in the committee day after day, hearing the witnesses testify on these various items, did have the benefit of that report and the recommendations made by those who had spent 6 years studying the problem of mental health in the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Alabama is correct; and I think that is one of the best ways to spend money to save money.

I should like to state that the figures I quoted for Howard University were increases over the amounts for 1961, when we found that need existed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. However, I point out that no part of my amendments would affect the amounts to be provided for Howard University. My amendments leave untouched the items for Howard University.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was wrong, and the Senator from Wisconsin is correct. I am assured also that the Senator from Wisconsin would not have proposed cuts in the amounts for Howard University, even if the amounts recommended by the committee had exceeded the amounts of the budget estimates. However, the amounts our committee has recommended do not exceed the amounts of the budget estimates.

Mr. HILL. But the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin do propose

cuts in the amounts which are desperately needed today for Gallaudet College, the only one of its kind in all the world—a college for instruction of the deaf. Is not that true?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin would reduce by \$530,000 the funds which are so vitally needed to raise the teachers' salary scale at this unusual, unique school, the only one of its kind, where the deaf are taught to overcome their handicap and to live with comfort and to carry on useful lives even though they are deaf. All that is made possible by the work done at Gallaudet College.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator probably has already covered this point, but I did not hear the discussion, because I was out of the Chamber for a moment. Is it a fact that the proposed amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would cut funds which are calculated to go to the Hill-Burton program, which builds hospitals over the United States?

Mr. MONRONEY. To be absolutely fair, and I certainly wish to be, we raised the budget by this amount. The amendment would cut the amount back to the budget amount, which would mean there would be \$25 million less for Hill-Burton matching funds, which would probably mean a total of \$100 million, because the States usually do better than a 50-50 matching. There is being proposed a slight increase over the 1961 level. Over \$400 million in funds are waiting to be matched. Even with the amount that we are proposing to appropriate, \$25 million over and above the budget amount, it will be some 3 years before we can reach all of the communities that are hoping to have hospital facilities with the help of the Hill-Burton program.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is the reason why the committee increased the amount—to make it possible for areas without adequate facilities, that have already put up their money—

Mr. MONRONEY. They have the money and are ready to put it up.

Mr. SMATHERS. They are ready to put it up, but because the Federal Government is not ready to supply its part of the money, they are not able to have adequate hospital facilities. That is the reason why the committee has brought in a larger amount than recommended by the budget. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. We have done so each year, and each year the Budget, which is supposed to be sacrosanct, follows next year the committee action of the previous year, because the Budget has realized that the funds that were justly required and necessary—and a lot more, besides.

Mr. SMATHERS. I certainly wish to congratulate the committee on that item, as well as other items, but particularly that one, because I know of no greater need in my State—and I am sure it is true in other States—than that for medical and hospital facilities. This is the way to do it. If we are going to make cuts in the bill, there are other places

where it would be much better to make cuts than in this particular item.

I congratulate the committee for its action.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that a young doctor entering medical practice today will not locate in a place unless he has the tools to do his best work, and in order to have those tools, he has to have a good hospital?

Mr. MONRONEY. He is trained in a hospital. He is trained to use X-ray and other modern tools. He has gone through the long and tedious process of becoming a physician, and he cannot operate in a one-room office in a small building in a small town. It has been the establishment of Hill-Burton hospitals that has caused the spread of qualified young physicians over the country, who are willing to move into areas because there is available laboratory and other equipment, so they can use the skills that have been learned in the universities.

Mr. HILL. It may be of interest to know that under the Hill-Burton program \$4,700 million have been invested in hospitals and health facilities. Out of the \$4,700 million, only \$1,400 million have been in Federal funds, whereas the States and local communities have put up the remaining \$3,300 million.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I ask the Senator from Alabama a question, because he is more familiar with the details?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is not the program for research in smaller hospitals also affected by the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin? This is a program which is beginning to grow, because we realize all the brains are not located in Washington or New York or Cambridge. It is designed to bring into the program doctors located across the country, when they can get away from their practice, so they can make their contributions to medical research, thus expanding the base for medical research by a ratio of 10 to 1.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. Funds provided in the bill would permit a substantial increase in research centers over the country.

Mr. MONRONEY. That program is to give the local physician who has worked in a particular field an opportunity, under controlled research, to make use of his talents, as well as those of local technicians, and to spread this program beyond the confines of the National Institutes of Health or other giant hospitals.

Mr. HILL. Teams work in the research centers.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is not the Senator from Wisconsin, by his amendment, objecting to the doubling of the amount for that purpose from \$7 million to \$15 million?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. The reason why the amount was smaller last year was that it was the choice of the committee to try the program out, and let it grow, and not jump into a full-blown program all at once. It will grow. Thousands of physicians could not otherwise make their contributions to the heart and cancer centers.



Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. One of the amendments which the Senator from Wisconsin is seeking to have adopted would cut out the additional \$250,000 which the committee wisely provided for the Arctic Health Center, an agency of the U.S. Public Health Service. This is the only institution in the United States which is doing research in the field of arctic and subarctic disease and grappling with the environmental conditions there which cause ill health. There is a whole field of medicine there which is, in a way, as important as the field of tropical medicine, which long ago was recognized as a special branch of medicine and accorded proper attention. This Arctic Health Center is the one institution doing that work, in this no less important but hitherto almost totally ignored field. It has been starved. Funds provided have not been adequate. If we are in a contest with Russia, and we are now providing an additional \$3½ billion for defense, certainly the health of our military and civilians who operate in the arctic and subarctic climates is important. To reduce that item would be shortsighted and tragic. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. MONRONEY. Very little arctic research has been done. Yet we have a great interest in the Arctic today.

Mr. GRUENING. It is the one institution where we can train our people to live in the Arctic and cope with its unique problems of climate, permafrost, and water supply. They are subject to diseases of which medicine knows very little, because we have not had that experience before. The Russians are far ahead of us. This \$250,000, for which we are very grateful to the committee for adding, will help in a small measure to lessen the gap. It is sorely needed. The effort to remove it should be defeated.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I simply want to join my colleague from Alaska, first in complimenting the committee for having added to the amount recommended by the Budget and allowed by the House, \$500,300, the amount of \$250,000, and to express the hope that the amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will not prevail.

I think this whole situation was very well stated in the presentation made before the committee by Dr. Colyar, who is head of the Arctic Research Center, in these words:

Alaskan and northern populations like standards of housing, waste disposal, water supply, heat, food, insect control, general sanitation and health and medical services comparable to those enjoyed elsewhere in the United States.

There it is. The work that has been done by the Arctic Health Research Center in the few years, comparatively, of its existence has done very much to change all this, but that work has been

on more or less of a pilot basis, always without adequate funds.

The proposal before us now for three-quarters of a million dollars will not allow this center to engage adequately in the work that is required to be done in the Arctic.

We ought not to lose any time at all in launching and in keeping going scientific investigations in that area, which will become increasingly important in the world of tomorrow.

At the present time this research center is housed in one rather inadequate building, quonset huts and tents. There are not enough scientists. Those who are there are dedicated. They do not stay in town, as the saying goes, all the year around. They go out into the field. They live with the Eskimos. They live the hard way, because they are true scientists and wish to learn everything they can about the Arctic and the subarctic. They have made rather amazing discoveries already under trying conditions and under great handicaps. The scientists there are engaged in research relating to communicable diseases, water supply storage, waste disposal, and the effects of low temperatures on the human body.

I hope the time will soon come when we shall have before us a budgetary proposal for a really adequate building to house this chief Arctic scientific center of the United States. We need it, and we need it soon.

As my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has mentioned, the Soviet Union is doing far more in its Arctic research activities than the United States. Reliable sources indicate that at least one-third of the 739 Russian scientific institutions engaged in the study of medicine are pursuing arctic and subarctic health studies. The Arctic Research Center, on the other hand, is the only permanent installation in North America which is making a sustained effort to acquire knowledge of health, bacteriological, biological, and related conditions. If we are to utilize these vast arctic and subarctic areas as they should and can be utilized, we must understand and be able to resist those environmental factors which naturally make habitation impractical and hazardous.

I wish to point out that the Public Health Service has repeatedly asked for these additional funds. Our arctic research program has been at a standstill relative to our efforts in other fields. In 1952, the personnel at the center numbered 60. By 1961 only 47 people were employed there. Whereas costs are constantly increasing, there has been no significant increase in funds allotted to research in this vital area. Yet it is entirely clear that the Arctic and subarctic will shortly be indispensable to our welfare, in peace as well as in war.

Mr. President, 17 percent of Alaska is properly in the Arctic zone; some 26 percent of Canada and 16 percent of the Soviet Union lie in the Arctic. I wish to stress, therefore, the national significance of the discoveries which may be made if this appropriation measure is passed. Arctic areas cover 300 million square miles of the earth's surface. The pressures of population will inevitably

precipitate large scale migrations to these areas. In short, problems of arctic habitation are not insurmountable. Today we do not know enough. Perhaps tomorrow we will.

We must at least match the strides Russian scientists are taking in the Arctic. We cannot afford to sit back and wait until a full utilization of arctic resources becomes necessary for our survival. We must be prepared for what we know will come. We must expand our efforts.

The recommended increase in funds for fiscal year 1962 would be used to finance four projects. The first is to investigate earth impoundments for arctic water-supply storage facilities. Permafrost and surface saturation challenge the best engineering skills to devise workable water supply and distribution systems. The harvest of ice and snow for human consumption, used by a number of our defense installations in remote regions of the Arctic, is next to impossible in a civilian economy. The average household in an urban community would have to pay \$200 per month for its water supply if it were forced to rely on such a harvest. Methods for pumping and piping water at subfreezing temperatures have already been devised. Economical storage of large quantities of water, however, remains an unsolved problem. Needless to say, an adequate supply of fresh water at a reasonable cost to the consumer is the first step toward the elimination of disease.

A second project would investigate means to improve facilities for sewage disposal. Twenty households in the Anchorage and Fairbanks areas could be selected as models to develop a guide for the operation of septic tanks and tile fields in the State. It is estimated that from 2 to 3 years will be required for completion of the study, analysis of data, and formulation of operational guides.

The third project is designed to study the physiological factors by which animal and human life adjust to low-temperature environments. Specifically, the 1961 and 1962 goals are to determine the extent to which directed training and experience can increase cold tolerance.

The information which may be obtained will, of course, be useful not only to civilians, but also to those soldiers who may be forced to engage in armed conflict in arctic areas.

The last project to be financed by the contemplated increase in funds is to expand research already being carried out in epidemiology. Dr. A. B. Colyar, medical officer in charge of the Arctic Research Center, has stated that epidemiology is the heart of preventive medicine and an essential supportive element in all public health research. I need not, in view of my earlier remarks, consume the time of the Senate in elaboration of the significance of this research.

I wish only to add, in conclusion, that two of these projects—those involving waste disposal and water storage—are new, and that the other two will permit the center to continue valuable work which has already been done. Dr. Colyar has submitted detailed plans which need funds in order to be realized.

Dr. Colyar, all the scientists, and the staff at the center are making with insufficient funds many magnificent contributions to a vital area of human knowledge. I am grateful, therefore, to the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee for providing more money to allow increased efforts in this research work which is important to all of us, whether we are residents of Alaska, of Florida, or of any other State in the Union.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for giving me this time to state my very positive and deeply felt conclusions on this subject. I hope no amendment to reduce the amount allowed by the committee will prevail.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we appreciate the very excellent presentation by both Senators from Alaska. We felt this was a very necessary item. I believe it will stand the test of the subcommittee's judgment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the Senator from Oklahoma as a Senator and as a citizen for his valiant support of the committee recommendations, and particularly of the work of the subcommittee and of the chairman of the subcommittee, who has pioneered the work in medical care and medical research.

The first point I wish to make is that while we do respect the guidelines of the Bureau of the Budget there is nothing in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 which says that when the Bureau of the Budget sends a proposal to the Congress that is the end of the discussion. The purpose of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, first, was to prevent separate departments from going to the Congress with separate budgets and, second, to allow the President to present an overall coordinated program. It was made quite clear that the Congress would not lose control over the purse strings, nor would Congress lose its initiative.

SENATE SHOULD SUPPORT \$835.6 MILLION FOR NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

I should like to express a few of the reasons why the Senate should support the action of its Appropriations Committee in approving \$835.6 million for the National Institutes of Health for the 1962 fiscal year.

My reasons are:

First. The danger to our national security because of the Berlin crisis should mean greater, not a lesser effort for medical research.

Second. Death and disability among our civilian population will "not take a holiday," merely because of the Berlin emergency.

Third. Expenditures for medical research mean more, and not less, revenue to the Federal Government.

PROTECTING THE HEALTH OF OUR TROOPS

First, Berlin is but one point on the global chessboard.

The Kremlin may at any time move a pawn in Europe, for example, in Berlin, in order to divert us from a main move

in the Far East, for example, in Vietnam, or it may precipitate a crisis in Asia to divert us from Berlin.

In my judgment, there will be a greater—not lesser—danger in the months ahead, that American troops may become involved in limited war in tropical areas of the globe. This would put a special premium on NIH programs of many types to solve the mysteries of disease which are endemic to tropical areas. I refer, for example, to:

First, the program of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases—for support of university and other research at home and abroad on parasitic and other types of infectious disease.

Second, the program of the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Disorders for support of the Interdepartmental Committee on Nutrition for National Defense—which makes surveys of dietary problems in foreign lands.

Third, the support by other categorical institutes of research programs abroad, for example, by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness of viral encephalitis—which afflicts many tropical countries, among others.

More and more, the United States is supplying the training and other missions to cope with guerrilla-type operations in places like Laos, Vietnam, and so forth.

We owe it to the American personnel assigned to these nations to provide every possible means of protection for them against the dangers of disease.

The Senate need not be reminded of the fearful toll which World War II took on the health of American servicemen who fought in the malaria-ridden jungles, swamps and rice paddies of southeast Asia.

Veterans' hospitals are today filled with men who were stopped—not by enemy bullets—but by mysterious bacteria and viruses in strange areas of the world.

DEATH TAKES NO HOLIDAY

Second, deaths among our civilian population will take no holiday because of the Berlin crisis.

No Member of the Senate is unaware of the strain which has been put on the Federal budget because of increased expenditures required by the Berlin crisis and by the long period of danger facing the Nation. But whether the Defense budget is \$42 billion or \$45 billion or more, there is a human budget which is the most important single budget of all.

In this calendar year, 1961, whether or not a single American life is lost over Berlin, 1.6 million Americans will die from causes of all types.

Based upon rates of previous years, over 910,000 of these Americans will die of cardiovascular disease alone. Can anyone put a dollar sign on the value of these 1.6 million American lives? The answer is, "Of course not."

There are 14 million or so Americans with diseases of the heart, circulation, and kidneys. The report by the Senate Appropriations Committee suggests a 1960 expenditure of \$160 million for the National Heart Institute. This would

amount to a little over \$10 per victim of heart disability. Surely, that cannot be regarded as excessive.

As Senator HILL's report points out on page 38:

The number of Americans killed by heart disease in 6 months equals our total battle casualties in all 4 years of World War II.

If the Senate were to cut back medical research funds because of the need for increased national defense expenditures, then by that precedent, we might have to cut back medical research funds indefinitely into the future.

The reason is, that for the rest of our lives, we are probably going to encounter an unending series of dangers, posed by the Soviet Union.

We cannot suspend indefinitely the needs of our own citizens.

There is a time urgency about medical research. One minute ago, two Americans died of heart disease, and a minute from now two more will be dead. Every minute of the year some American somewhere is suffering from a new disease or disability.

Time is of the essence in the effort to find the answers to unlock the mysteries of disease.

A month, a year lost in medical research can never really be recovered, because men, women, and children suffer and die in the interim.

RESPECT FOR NEW RECOMMENDATIONS

As assistant majority leader, I am deeply cognizant of the administration's position. I am well aware of the levels of appropriations, as recommended by the able Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. But I am also aware that the Senate has the prerogative and the responsibility to make its own evaluation as to what the right level of appropriations should be.

CITIZEN GROUP URGED \$967 MILLION

The Senate need not and should not turn a deaf ear to the distinguished private medical experts and citizens who appeared before the Committee on Appropriations.

Let it be recalled that the citizen witnesses recommended an NIH total of \$967 million or \$130 million more than what Senator HILL and his colleagues approved.

And while the Appropriations Committee version will be a great step forward, it will still leave serious deficiencies in support of many major medical programs, according to voluntary health experts and others.

I refer, for example, to research and demonstration programs in fields such as mental retardation.

INCREASED REVENUE FROM MEDICAL RESEARCH

Third, medical research expenditure probably represents one of the greatest boons to increased revenue to the Federal Treasury. It is a revenue creator, a stimulus to the tax base.

Medical research saves lives; it prolongs lives; it reduces disability; it eliminates disability. It puts wage earners back on their feet, so that they can become taxpayers.

It helps take the sick and indigent off the relief-welfare rolls and enables them to become self-supporting citizens.



Senator HILL's subcommittee has, in effect, saved the U.S. Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars every single year in tax revenue which might otherwise have been lost because of disease, disability and premature death. Similarly, his subcommittee has reduced the amount of inflation which might otherwise have occurred. In inflation, the supply of goods and services is reduced in relation to the supply of outstanding currency. Thanks to medical research, such individuals become health producers and consumers; thereby, they are enabled to increase the supply of goods and services.

#### INTEREST OF SENATE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Finally, I should like to mention that the views which I present are based, as I have previously noted, on facts compiled in the course of my work as chairman of a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee which has been looking at problems of interagency coordination.

The Committee on Government Operations is concerned with Federal economy and efficiency. We are interested in saving money for the American taxpayers—in getting a dollar's worth of value out of every dollar spent.

Since August 1958, we have compiled data on how the National Institutes of Health have carried on their research programs.

We have pointed out a great many ways in which we believe NIH could improve its efforts, notably in the field of coordination of information on medical science. We will continue to make recommendations for NIH improvements.

But it should be carefully noted that we have found that there is a remarkable degree of unanimity within the medical community as to the caliber of NIH work. Rarely in my experience with executive agencies, have I seen a greater degree of support for a single Federal agency than is the case with NIH.

I believe, therefore, that NIH should receive this vote of confidence and continued support.

#### PUBLIC WELFARE PERSONNEL TRAINING GRANTS, LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATIONS BILL, JULY 29, 1961

Mr. President, I also wish to compliment the Senator from Alabama and his subcommittee for including in this bill \$2 million for the initiation of a program of public welfare worker training grants. As I stated on the floor earlier this session, I believe such a program has been long overdue.

The aim of all social welfare programs must be rehabilitation of the individual, not merely the maintenance of life at some minimum level. Social rehabilitation is an extremely difficult task in some of these cases. This job calls for highly trained public welfare workers as well as those with broad experience. New methods of rehabilitation are constantly being developed; new techniques are perfected. Social workers should have every opportunity to return to school and acquire this knowledge.

This year the Social Security Act was amended to provide for 100 percent Federal financing of public welfare worker

training grants. The administration submitted a revised budget request of \$3.5 million. This estimate was submitted directly to the Senate after the House had completed action on the bill. Therefore this appropriation of \$2 million must go to conference.

Considering the circumstances of this request, I earnestly hope that the House conferees will find it possible to accept the entire \$2 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee. This is a vital program which should have been activated many years ago. In my opinion the sum of \$2 million is required to make a worthwhile beginning this year.

Again, Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Alabama for recognizing the validity of this request. The opportunities for advanced study which this appropriation will provide to public welfare workers will create a new morale—a new sense of dedication—among these underpaid and overworked public servants. The money needed to finance these training grants is, in fact, a lasting investment in these people, an investment which will be repaid many times in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I delivered before the HEW Appropriations Subcommittee concerning these public welfare training grants be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE FOR DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, JUNE 20, 1962

Mr. Chairman, I wish to endorse the administration's recent request for \$3.5 million for the training of public welfare personnel.

I know the members of this subcommittee are well acquainted with the facts surrounding this request. Funds were originally authorized in the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act. Unfortunately, an appropriation was never made. Recently an amendment to the emergency aid to dependent children legislation increased the Federal share of these training grants to 100 percent. President Kennedy has now formally requested that \$3.5 million be appropriated for this program in fiscal year 1962.

In 1956, the purpose of this program was clear: to enable public welfare personnel to receive the advanced study and training necessary for the productive operation of public welfare programs. As many witnesses before this subcommittee have indicated, this purpose is no less valid today. And the need for this training is substantially greater.

Productive operation of public welfare programs is, in my opinion, the crucial concept we must always consider. This means much more than the orderly distribution of public money to these unfortunate public charges. It means—first and foremost—a concerted effort to lead these recipients of welfare assistance toward higher degrees of self-help and self-care. It is primarily a job of social rehabilitation.

This is a difficult job. Welfare department personnel work under a crushing caseload, often averaging from 100 to 150 cases per worker. The need to reduce this burden often means that social workers are hired before they receive the desirable level of professional training. Departments find themselves unable to grant subsequent leaves of absence so workers can return for advanced study. Under these conditions a thorough

job of social rehabilitation simply is not possible. Social workers lack both time and training for this type of long-term operation.

I am sure we agree that public welfare means more than the maintenance of these people at a minimum level of assistance which keeps body and soul together. We have the duty to demand that public welfare personnel attempt to bring these people toward the ultimate goal of self-care, self-help, and the development of sound and healthy family life.

But, in demanding this, we have also placed upon ourselves the concurrent obligation to insure that these welfare workers receive the training required to develop the skill and understanding to perform this difficult job of rehabilitation.

From personal conversations I have had with professional social workers, I know that startling results have been achieved with even the most disorganized families when adequate rehabilitation services are available. Intensive and extended counseling of ADC families have produced dramatic improvements in family relationships, school attendance, health practices, employment records, and housing. These results have been obtained in many seemingly hopeless situations—provided trained personnel are available to work with these persons.

If we act on President Kennedy's recommendation and provide the \$3.5 million requested, 700 to 800 training opportunities would be made available at an annual average cost of \$3,000 each. While this would be just a beginning in relation to the total need, it would nevertheless be a noteworthy beginning.

It would provide tangible evidence of long-overdue Federal concern in this area. It would provide a tremendous boost of morale within this group of conscientious and hard-working State and local public welfare workers.

Finally, this appropriation would represent a long-term investment in the Nation's future generations. Social work service, administered by skilled and well-trained personnel, constitutes the major hope of rescuing future generations from a life of poverty and destitution. This is an investment we can well afford to make.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This program in the whole field of health demonstrates the initiative of the Congress and what it can mean to the public and to public welfare. The Senator from Alabama, who has earned for himself an international reputation in this field, cited a while ago, hospital construction. Before the Hill-Burton Act, hospital construction throughout the communities of America was very limited. It is still inadequate. We still have a great need for hospital facilities, more than currently are available.

It was the "seed money" so to speak—the grant under the proposal known as the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act—which brought out \$3 of local participation for every dollar of Federal funds. That has improved the general health of America. It has improved medical care of the people. It has improved medical science, as well as hospital administration.

Had we waited for the Bureau of the Budget to act, we would have been far behind in hospital construction. The proposal we have before us not only provides for hospital construction but also provides for diagnostic centers and special treatment centers. All of this has been pioneered in the Congress.

I think it is fair to say, with all due respect to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that the initiative in respect to health has been taken by the Congress. The National Institutes have been set up by amendments offered on the floor of the Senate or on the floor of the House. I wish to make the record clear that in respect to every one of the National Institutes—Heart, Cancer, Neurological Diseases—the Bureau of the Budget request has always been less than what the Congress has ultimately appropriated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator concede that there is a new Director of the Budget; a new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and a new President of the United States, and that this is his program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is what the President has asked for. This is not a program which was asked for at a previous time. The President is a real expert in this field, and a compassionate expert at that. He believes deeply and strongly in these programs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has a pretty good record of support of this administration. I am here as an administration spokesman and an administration supporter.

I wish to make the record clear. No President is going to veto this appropriation bill because the Congress sees fit to provide for hospital facilities. As a matter of fact, if the international situation is as grave as people say it is, and as grave as I think it is, it might not be a bad idea to have better health protection. We should not be closing up the health programs because of the Berlin crisis; if anything, we should be improving them. If anything is related to the health, the welfare, the security, and the defense of the American people, it is exactly what we are talking about this afternoon.

I repeat: There simply would not have been cancer research had it not been started by the initiative of the Senate of the United States. If I recall correctly, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was one of the originators of the idea of the Heart Institute. It was not the U.S. Public Health Service. It was not the agencies of the executive branch. I do not say these agencies do not do good work, for they do good work. I do not complain about that. I simply say that in my 12½ years in the Senate, I have seen one institute after another added by action of the Congress.

There is an institute on arthritis, a crippling disease, the pain and agony of which is beyond human description. Congress took the lead.

The same is true with respect to one after another of the institutes. Who has been in the forefront? It has been some of our colleagues like the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], on mental health, and other Senators. I

remember the battles we have been through.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may add a few more names?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE].

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have tried to make our modest contributions. Every Senator, in the main, has participated in support of these great measures.

I remember one of the first measures upon which I voted, when I came to the Senate in 1949. The Bureau of the Budget, under a Democratic administration, had come to the Congress with an appropriation request which was far too small in regard to hospital construction. The Senator from Alabama and his subcommittee came before the Senate, after adding more money. Did that bankrupt the country? I will tell the Senators that it made America a better place. Our people are entitled to that kind of care. It also brought participation from the communities.

One other point needs to be made. If Senators think that the Committee on Appropriations is composed of extravagant men, I wish to say that some of the more frugal and prudent Members of Congress are members of that committee. I will exclude the junior member of the committee, for I am the youngest of the members of the committee in terms of seniority. Senators can write me off, but I submit that that committee is known for its frugality and is known for its careful examination of budget requests.

We have a recommendation from the citizens' committee. Who are members of that citizens' committee? That committee is not made up of wild-eyed radicals. The citizens' committee is made up of some of the leading specialists in the world in the field of medical care and medical research.

I add that the Committee on Appropriations and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HILL], instead of allowing what the citizens' committee recommended, cut the request of the citizens' committee \$132 million. We ought to be scolding them for that, instead of going around pretending we have been asked to appropriate too much.

Mr. President, I simply add that the request which has been made is one which can be justified on the basis of fiscal policy, on the basis of national security, on the basis of public health, and on the basis of long-term investment.

We recently appropriated \$1,700,000 for outer space activities. We did not even argue about the appropriation in the Senate. I think it is all right. We must take such action. We do not know what the future has to offer. We took a calculated risk.

(At this point, Mr. HICKEY took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me remind Senators that since I have been in this body one Senator after another has been stricken with cancer or heart disease. I remember when the

late and beloved Senator from Nebraska, Ken Wherry, sat here. I remember when the late and beloved Senator from Ohio, Bob Taft, sat here. I remember when the late and beloved Senator Brian McMahon and the late and beloved Senator Matthew Neely were in this Chamber. I cannot call the entire roll. If America could find the answer to cancer, if we could find some of the answers to arthritis, if we could find some of the answers to mental disease we would for all time have claimed for ourselves glory and earned it.

I feel that it may be more important now to know what goes on inside the body that grips this frame of ours with pain and disease, than even to know what goes on beyond outer space. Both projects are important.

I believe the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and his colleagues who fought the good fight during the year have given us the kind of leadership that we need.

This is not a one-man show. The Senator from Alabama would not want it that way. But we have had leadership in the Senate that has earned for this body a decent reputation for foresight and statesmanship. Would that America had it every time on every subject. There is not a Senator present who is not proud of his service in the Senate because of what we have done in the field of health, because of what we have done for general research, because of what we have been able to do for hospital construction, research facilities, and medical training. These are the projects that we go home with, and these are the things that mothers remember. They come up and thank us for a child saved at our National Institutes of Health through an operation on the heart, a broken body or a broken mind healed. Why? Because we had some foresight.

Someone will say, "This activity costs money."

It would cost a great deal more not to undertake it. If the extra money which the committee has added to the appropriation could even come close to bringing about some relief from arthritis, we would have saved more in medical costs to the consumer than all the budgets for health research put together.

I have had filled my full share of prescriptions. I know a little about this subject, both from a technical and a layman's point of view. The advances that we have made in pharmaceuticals, surgery, medical care, hospital construction, and hospital management have more than saved all the increase in the budget that the Senator from Alabama is recommending today.

I suggest that if we want economy, Senators should support the recommendation of the committee. If we want to risk the future, we can start cutting the proposed appropriation, and then we will let the chickens come home to roost. I do not wish to indicate by my vote that I thought my advice was better than that of the citizens committee.

We have at least gone part of the way. I hope that we will sustain the committee, not only because it has done the right thing morally and professionally,



but because I think the action was taken for the future betterment of medicine.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to address the Senate with respect to another subject, but before I do so, I hope I will be forgiven if I may compliment the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the two Senators from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING and Mr. BARTLETT] for their statements on the bill.

I happen to have the honor of being one of that company that sponsored the bill to create the National Heart Institute in the other body when I was a new Representative. I will agree with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that I am extremely proud of that. I have often said, "Of all the things I did in Congress, I think this measure gave me the most gratification." Perhaps other things I might have done were more useful to the Nation, but the action gave me the greatest pleasure.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], a question for the benefit of those of us who have not sat in on the hearings and have not had the benefit of the knowledge and the detailed information which the chairman has, and who have heard conflicting views. On the one hand, we have heard views with respect to the budget. I agree with the principle that we are either a Congress or we are not. If we were to accept the budget request, whether from the Republican administration or the Democratic administration, we would be rubberstamps. I am not persuaded by such argument at all. But taking the budget figure and the figure of the citizens' committee, could we have a statement from the chairman which would give us the criterion of judgment? What was the formula that the committee used in fixing the figure? How did the committee arrive at such and such a figure of increase, when there are very large increases added to the requests, rather than taking the budget figures or the citizens' committee's figures? I would like to know if there was any formula which was used, or perhaps one or two examples of applicability in respect to the fields in question. The information would be helpful to me.

Mr. HILL. I know of the deep interest of my friend from New York in this subject. As he said, when he was in the House of Representatives, he was one of the authors of the act that brought into being the National Heart Institute. The action on the appropriations was not what we would call a mathematical problem, applying so much to each item in terms of a formula. We took the testimony which came to us from the distinguished doctors and biological scientists and went over each item very carefully. We weighed the testimony in terms of what was requested and in terms of the budget figure, and then sought to arrive at what we thought was a figure that would be wise and would be supported by the Senate and the House in order to take

a very definite step forward in the battle against these dread diseases.

Mr. JAVITS. Then the formula used was a pragmatic judgment, a judgment on the facts, which differed in each case?

Mr. HILL. Yes, I would say the Senator is correct, because we considered many different questions with respect to the different Institutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Was there any dissent in either the subcommittee or the main committee?

Mr. HILL. In the subcommittee there were no nay votes. When the full committee voted there were no nay votes.

Mr. JAVITS. It is then fair to say that the appropriation came to us as the pragmatic judgment of the subcommittee and the committee?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

#### EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had in mind speaking for a few minutes today on a subject which is considered to be one of the most momentous economic developments in our history and that of the United Kingdom.

These are mundane subjects, but I assure the Senate that in my view the announcement the United Kingdom is contemplating membership in the European Economic Community is perhaps more portentous than Khrushchev's activities in connection with Berlin. The action will certainly last longer in terms of our world unless we are stupid enough to blow ourselves up.

In a world engaged not in a hot but in a cold war, it is news that could be even more important than the Berlin crisis because the trade of the world, which represents the key to the development of the less developed nations, may well determine whether a billion-plus people will go our way or the Communist way.

To give an idea of the order of magnitude which this action involves, the free world's exports and imports amount to \$225 billion a year, while overseas aid of all kinds other than military from all countries and from international agencies, plus overseas private investments, amount to between \$8 to \$10 billion.

Those are the relative orders of magnitude that we deal with when we deal with trade.

There is the other fact, Mr. President, that 25 percent, or one-quarter, of the exports of the United States will go to what will be the European Common Market when the British have joined it. Right now that market is 16 percent. We are talking about a market of about 300 million people when the United Kingdom and the other countries are associated in the Common Market Community.

Under those circumstances, I would like to leave two points with my colleagues in the Senate, which are critically important. The first is that it should be made crystal clear to the United Kingdom and to the nations of the European Economic Community that we consider it good, not bad, for the free world for the United Kingdom to join

the Common Market, and that we look upon it with sympathy and satisfaction.

The British have a very hard decision to make. It is a momentous decision for the world. They are entitled to know how we feel about it, whether we are afraid of it or whether we favor it. We should tell the world that we favor it.

Second, we would be making a fatal error if we failed to prepare ourselves to deal with it. The administration is not taking on the trade struggle now, and this has deprived us of the time and backing and debate and hearings which are necessary to prepare ourselves for meeting the issue in connection with the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which will expire in 1962. In this critical field there must be no dereliction. I can say this, because I have supported this administration time and again. This is a very vital matter indeed, and must be dealt with now. We are hearing Big Ben toll now. We had better listen. If we do not, we will find our prosperity very seriously affected.

Mr. President, we are talking about an enormous market involving 300 million people.

So I say to my friends who are talking about quotas and about tariffs, to remember what we are up against in this situation, in connection with this enormous market, probably the greatest the world has ever seen, with a gross national product equal to our own. This is the first time that we have seen this happen. This newly expanded European Common Market will have a gross national product of \$500 billion.

The Russians have a gross national product of about \$220 billion, and the European countries themselves now have a gross national product of \$160 billion. Now we are going to be talking about an equal power with our own, and we had better prepare to meet it. We must do so not by drawing back into fortress America in an economic sense, but by being ready to trade and to do business. We can do that if we will renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

This is a momentous and historic development, at the very time when the Russians have told us that they expect to beat us economically, after Khrushchev has told us that they expect to bury us, and at a time, also, when the whole Communist world is trying to reconstitute itself with a new party program, as published in today's newspapers and published in text in the New York Times. This is certainly no time for us to be blind to the economic realities of the world.

Therefore, I make these two points: First, let us show the world that we sympathize with and like the idea of Britain joining the expanded Common Market Community and, second, let us begin to cooperate to deal with this Community on terms of equality. At the same time, let us legislate to meet the complaints of businesses and industries and workers who are adversely affected by concentrated imports. In short, let us understand the economic facts of life.

If we do that, this can be the greatest victory our world has had in recent time.

# DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEATING. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin subject to division?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not subject to division.

Mr. KEATING. Therefore, there is no way whereby a Member of the Senate can ask for an opportunity to vote on any one of the items contained in the amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. KEATING. That would be the only way in which I would have an opportunity to vote on any one item. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

(At this point Mr. HICKEY took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

## EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly on a matter of great urgency in New York City, which does not pertain to the pending amendment. This involves a rather interesting communication which I received recently from the Governor of New Jersey, Robert B. Meyner.

The Governor has set out to prevent channel 13, in the New York metropolitan area, from being purchased for educational television purposes.

Governor Meyner has informed me that he is not opposed to educational television as such. He is merely opposed to an educational television station to be operated for the benefit of the entire New York area, including northern New Jersey, in place of a commercial television station nominally assigned by the Federal Communications Commission to Newark, N.J.

In order to forestall what he views as a catastrophe, he has filed with the FCC a lengthy brief that purports to demonstrate the evils of turning the Newark television channel over to educational television.

An examination of this brief reveals the fact that Governor Meyner is very far from regarding the current situation as ideal. Rather, formal commitment of channel 13 to educational purposes would do little more in the Governor's opinion than perpetuate a mischievous policy that has actually been in effect since 1958.

In that year, the management of channel 13 revised its programming in an effort to bring to the New York area presentations of a quality frequently unavailable on commercial television. In connection with this policy, dramatic shows such as "Play of the Week," discussion programs like "Open End," and many original public service broadcasts were offered. This new departure in programming was

widely praised in the press and won considerable viewer acceptance. Audiences were found to be available in New York, Connecticut, and northern New Jersey for shows of the highest quality that the best brains in television could devise.

Governor Meyner, however, was not impressed. Examining the record of channel 13 prior to 1958, he found that the loss far outweighed the gain. In his brief to the FCC he provides 47 examples of the kind of programs that appeared on channel 13 when it devoted itself primarily to New Jersey concerns.

Of this total, 12 are purely political broadcasts. I have some professional sensitivity on the value of political broadcasts, and will say nothing more of these. Among the remaining examples, however, are included such intriguing titles as "Junior Frolics," "Requestfully Yours," "Coffee Club," and "Rate the Record." I was particularly interested in "Requestfully Yours," which is described as a show of "New Jersey teenage music and dance program." Can it be that New Jersey teenage music is different from the teenage music being pumped out through jukeboxes and TV dance programs in other parts of this country? I respectfully submit that this is too much to be hoped for.

Other valuable items carried on channel 13 prior to 1958, according to Governor Meyner's brief, included professional wrestling from Newark, stock car racing from Jersey City, and the activities of the Newark Bears and the Jersey City Giants. Perhaps stretching a bit, Governor Meyner even includes a program entitled "Your Weatherman," as an example of the enlightened programming carried on by channel 13 before 1958.

All of these elevating shows, with the possible exception of the weatherman, were, the Governor implies, unwisely replaced by shows like "Open End" and "Play of the Week" after 1958. If the channel is turned over entirely to educational television, Governor Meyner fears, the fight to bring back "Requestfully Yours," and the Jersey City stock car races will be permanently lost. Worst of all, according to the Governor's brief, candidates for public office in New Jersey will be thrown back on New York and Philadelphia channels, which, "because most of their viewers have no interest in New Jersey politics and will tune out New Jersey campaign broadcasts," will charge top rates for such broadcasts.

Mr. President, I have no objection to "Rate the Record" and televised professional wrestling from Newark. I certainly have no objection to such a program as "Governor Meyner's Weekly Report," which has been a fixture on Channel 13 for the last 7 years. But are not most of these shows, or shows very much like them, already amply available on the host of commercial stations serving northern New Jersey? And is there any reason why the few worthwhile shows that cannot find a place on commercial television should not be taken up by the new educational channel? The educational television network has, in fact, promised that "the community interests of New Jersey will be served." Governor Meyner, however, has been re-

ported in the press as not appeased by this promise.

Admittedly, New Jersey has special problems. Most of its citizens live in the metropolitan areas of one of two great cities that it borders. I cannot believe, however, Mr. President, that the existing facilities of New York and Philadelphia do not, or cannot, pay proper attention to their millions of customers in New Jersey.

New York has a great opportunity in the proposed purchase of channel 13 for educational television, Mr. President. This proposal, wisely supported by the major commercial networks, will give the entire New York area service of a kind that it can never receive from commercial television alone.

I, of course, include all of northern New Jersey, when I speak of the New York area. I hope Governor Meyner will abandon the narrow perspective that has led him to suggest that channel 13 should be preserved for commercial television. I hope he will agree to the conversion of channel 13 to educational television, not merely for the good of New York, but for the good, also, of the residents of the northern counties of the great State of which he is Governor. If he does not agree, I hope the FCC will overrule his contentions.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I commend my colleague for his speech. I know that Senators are inclined to discount it as local propaganda, but it would be really most unfair to what is being presented. My colleague has presented not a local but a national issue, because this is the one chance to have a really big educational television outlet financed not by the Government but by private means.

I, too, have communicated with the Federal Communications Commission and with Governor Meyner. My colleague and I have the same reaction in giving this point of view.

I should like to add, to the wonderful presentation my colleague has made, the statement that the group which is seeking to acquire the station, which is a nonprofit group for educational purposes, has offered Governor Meyner anything he could legitimately ask for in the way of New Jersey programs. There is no desire to make the station appear to be anything other than a New Jersey station, although as a practical matter it has not been that. It has covered New Jersey only to a lesser rather than a greater extent.

Second, the statement has been made that Governor Meyner would become the first Governor to get within his State the greatest expression of educational television in the whole United States, which is far more important than another television channel, of which we know there are so many. I think this is a national issue, and a basic one.

I am delighted that my colleague has taken it up in such a serious way. I hope very much that his words and mine, and those of others, will be listened to by Governor Meyner and by the regulatory authorities.



Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I agree with my colleague. I hope Governor Meyner will see the error of his ways.

I also agree with my colleague that this is a national issue. However, I do not apologize for this being an issue in New York. All of us who are Members of the Senate represent the cities and areas which have sent us here in considering questions of this kind, which involve both local and national considerations. As my colleague pointed out, this is indeed a problem which goes beyond New York. It is a national issue. The people who have joined together to promote educational television certainly have the interests of the general public at heart. They are to be commended for their action; they should be encouraged in it. I sincerely hope that the Federal Communications Commission will make a decision which will bear out this proposition.

#### U.S. SAVINGS BONDS REDEMPTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have just received from the Treasury Department the June 1961 report on sales and redemptions of series E and H savings bonds. These reports are sent to me regularly. On previous occasions I have indicated my deep concern over the disturbing trend whereby redemptions exceed sales of these bonds.

Though there has been some improvement in this situation following an increase in the interest rates from 3.26 percent to 3.75 percent, redemptions have continued to surpass sales. During the 24-month period ending June 30, 1961, the excess of E- and H-bond redemption over sales totaled \$1,358 million. Further evidence of this aggravating gap is reflected by the statistics for fiscal 1961; redemptions once again outdistanced sales.

There is some indication that this trend is receding and during the last 6 months sales achieved a slight edge. Percentage comparisons show that sales of E- and H-bonds were up 9 percent and redemptions were down 10 percent from June 1960. There has also been a decrease in the total excess of redemption values.

Nevertheless, at best, this reversal is in its infant stages and, if it is to be nurtured, action must be taken. Both in April and May of 1961 redemptions again surpassed sales. For some time I have been advocating that the Treasury Department take measures to prevent any further attrition of individual holdings which represent an important portion of our national debt and which demonstrate the interest of every American in his country's fiscal situation.

In 1959 the Congress authorized the Treasury Department to raise interest

rates on E- and H-bonds. I again urge that they be raised beyond the present 3.75 percent level to make investment in these securities more attractive. Furthermore, the Treasury should undertake a massive, patriotic drive to sell more of these bonds to the public. A special \$25 billion issue of peace bonds should be offered which would attract millions of new investors and remove some of the inflationary dangers inherent in our national debt. In order to emphasize the importance of the sale of these securities, what we now call savings bonds should be renamed peace bonds. If these measures are taken I believe that we will be able to effect a shift of the national debt into longer term securities.

At the present time of world crisis, when our Nation is in the front line of the cold war struggle and when our economy is being tested by the strain of international competition, I believe it is necessary to make maximum utilization of all of our resources while insuring our fiscal integrity. If these measures are adopted we shall be better able to meet the challenge of world leadership.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Treasury Department may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### The E- and H-bond picture

[In millions of dollars]

Last year	Sales <sup>1</sup>				Redemptions <sup>1</sup>				Net			Ex- changes of E for H	Outstanding in 1960	
	1959	1960	Change		1959	1960	Change		1959	1960	Change		End of period	Changes during period
			Amount	Percent			Amount	Percent						
June.....	323	340	+17	+5	470	438	-32	-7	-147	-98	+49	16	42,715	+21
Fiscal year.....	4,506	4,307	-199	-4	5,107	5,502	+395	+8	-601	-1,195	-594	201	42,715	-1
July.....	350	354	+3	+1	507	411	-96	-19	-156	-57	+99	17	42,779	+64
August.....	309	355	+47	+15	454	401	-53	-12	-145	-46	+100	15	42,827	+48
September.....	300	340	+40	+13	469	392	-77	-16	-169	-53	+117	11	42,868	+41
October.....	358	346	-12	-3	495	352	-143	-29	-137	-6	+131	10	42,953	+85
November.....	332	326	-5	-2	390	344	-46	-12	-58	-18	+40	11	43,028	+76
December.....	377	348	-29	-8	454	362	-92	-20	-77	-13	+63	12	43,137	+109
Calendar year.....	4,320	4,350	+30	+1	5,519	4,996	-523	-9	-1,199	-646	+554	278	43,137	+578

This year	Sales <sup>1</sup>				Redemptions <sup>1</sup>				Net			Ex- changes of E for H	Outstanding in 1961	
	1960	1961	Change		1960	1961	Change		1960	1961	Change		End of period	Changes during period
			Amount	Percent			Amount	Percent						
January.....	421	456	+35	+8	562	441	-121	-22	-142	+15	+157	22	43,278	+141
February.....	438	416	-22	-5	457	375	-82	-18	-19	+41	+60	17	43,416	+138
March.....	393	435	+41	+10	437	412	-25	-6	-44	+23	+66	22	43,536	+120
April.....	340	348	+8	+2	427	372	-55	-13	-88	-24	+64	15	43,607	+71
May.....	349	371	+21	+6	412	372	-40	-10	-63	-2	+61	16	43,703	+96
June.....	340	370	+30	+9	438	392	-46	-10	-98	-23	+75	18	43,806	+103
Fiscal year.....	4,307	4,464	+157	+4	5,502	4,627	-876	-16	-1,195	-163	+1,032	188	43,806	+91

<sup>1</sup> Sales and redemptions beginning January 1960 include exchanges of minor amounts of series F- and J-bonds for H-bonds but exclude exchanges of E-bonds for H-bonds.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Debt Analysis, July 7, 1961.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, despite the desires of my colleagues that the Senate should vote, I must regretfully inform them that it is necessary—perhaps in the interest of my own self-preservation, perhaps not—that I should address the Senate on the pending bill for a few minutes. If they feel inclined to carry on their conversations else-

where, I shall not feel affronted. But if they do not choose to listen to my brief résumé, I regret that I cannot, at the moment, under the present rules of the Senate, accede to their request since somewhat less than 67 of my colleagues have cried "vote," "vote," "vote."

I should like the attention of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I hope that, despite the able

speech he made concerning television stations in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, he will, nonetheless, be prepared to support my rule requiring germaneness when it comes before the subcommittee of which he is a member later in this session.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am inclined to support that proposal, but under the present rules of the Senate I consider my remarks as germane on the other side.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is within his rights. I have followed that course many times; I shall do so again until the rule is changed. I simply point out that this procedure results, all too frequently, in the inconveniencing of Senators who desire to complete the pending business and go home for dinner. Having been a violator, as has the Senator from New York, of the normal procedure of germaneness, I join him in the hope that the rule will be changed so that debate shall be required to be germane.

Mr. President, I support the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in opposition to the Proxmire amendments. My comments will also be construed, I hope, as in opposition to the amendments to be proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], which is substantially, although not entirely, identical with the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

I turn first to the question of appropriations for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act. I hope the Senate will defeat the proposal to reduce the appropriation for that purpose to the tune of \$25 million. Senators who care to refer to the committee report will find, on page 19, that it provides:

At the committee's request, the Public Health Service submitted a compilation, based on State reports, of anticipated construction of hospitals and other medical facilities. This indicates that States would be prepared. If unlimited Federal funds were available on the usual matching basis, to initiate construction of 43,754 beds under part C of the program, at an average bed cost of \$20,000. The Federal share of this construction would be over \$400 million. Although the present authorization of \$150 million is far short of this level, the provision of that amount will permit greater progress to be made toward reducing the present substantial deficit of general hospital beds and related facilities.

This is a matter of considerable importance to the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The commissioner of hospitals, Ira Mills, has advised me that there are presently pending in Pennsylvania 57 applications for Hill-Burton Act aid. Yet only 18 hospitals of that total of 57 will receive funds if the appropriation is to be cut back to the level of the budget requests, as the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Wisconsin have requested. However, if the committee's recommendation is adopted by Congress and approved by the President, 6 more hospitals or 24 in all in my State will receive funds, a total of less than half of those which have applied. Pennsylvania's share of the \$25 million involved

is \$1,375,000. I can state from personal knowledge of the condition of hospital care in Pennsylvania that the amount provided in this bill, as recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee, is substantially less than the amount required in order to give the people of Pennsylvania adequate hospital care; and I should be loath indeed to see the Congress act on a recommendation—to be sure, sent down by the President—to reduce the amount from that recommended by our Appropriations Committee.

It has been said in the course of this debate that this is President Kennedy's budget, that he has his own Director of the Budget, and that therefore we should be guided by what he recommends. Of course, this must have a certain plausible impact on those of us who as a rule support the President's general policy. But let me state that early this year the President made a basic decision, with which I was then in disagreement, and with which I am still in substantial disagreement. He undertook as a general rule to accept for the current fiscal year the budget amounts prepared under the direction of his predecessor. So what we are dealing with here is, substantially, not at all the Kennedy budget; but it is the Eisenhower budget, which has been adopted by the new administration, pending the time when it can come forward

with its own budget, next year. So I feel no hesitation in supporting our committee by voting to increase the amounts of the budget figures, and in saying to the President and his Budget Director, "I do not like the Eisenhower budget figures. I like the figures which have been submitted by the Senate Appropriations Committee, so far as I know"—and I hope the Senator from Alabama will correct me if I am wrong—"without substantial dissent by either Republicans or Democrats on the committee."

At any rate, there are no minority views before us, and I believe my statement is substantially correct.

Mr. HILL. Yes; the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I come now to the reductions proposed in the items for the National Institutes of Health. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a tabulation which shows the amounts of the Senate committee allowances, the recommendations of the citizens advisory groups, and the amounts by which the Senate committee's allowances fall below the amounts of the recommendations of the citizens advisory groups.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

	Senate committee allowance	Recommendation of citizens' advisory groups	Amount Senate committee allowance falls below advisory groups' recommendation
National Institutes of Health:			
General research and activities.....	\$140,000,000	\$153,100,000	\$13,100,000
National Cancer Institute.....	160,000,000	190,389,000	30,389,000
Mental health activities.....	125,570,000	149,000,000	23,430,000
National Heart Institute.....	160,100,000	210,000,000	49,900,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities.....	90,000,000	97,500,000	7,500,000
National Institute of Dental Research.....	20,000,000	21,350,000	1,350,000
Allergy and infectious disease activities.....	60,000,000	66,182,000	6,182,000
Neurology and blindness activities.....	80,000,000	85,900,000	5,900,000
Total.....	\$835,670,000	\$973,421,000	\$137,751,000

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, examination of the tabulation will show that the Senate committee's recommendations cut from the recommendations made by the citizens advisory groups, a total of \$137,751,000.

In examining the record, as I have done, I find that the recommendations of each of the advisory groups were documented at substantial length in the course of the hearings. Among the chairmen of those committees are some of the most famous physicians, public health workers, and general citizens in the Nation. One need only read the list of names, to be assured that the statement I made is entirely accurate. For instance, the expert in the field of arthritis and metabolic disease was Dr. Currier McEwen, professor of medicine at New York University. He made a presentation on behalf of the citizens advisory group in the area of arthritis and metabolic disease.

In the field of heart conditions, the presentation was made by Dr. Frederick J. Stare, professor of nutrition and chair-

man of the department of nutrition, Harvard University, Boston, Mass.

In the field of allergy and infectious diseases, the presentation was made by Dr. Walsh McDermott, professor of public health and chairman of the department, New York Hospital, Cornell Medical Center, New York City.

The recommendations of the American Dental Society were presented by Dr. Alfred E. Smith, of New Orleans, who, I believe, asked the committee to "look at the record," in order to determine whether or not the recommendations of the American Dental Society were a proper basis for the committee's recommendations. I do not know whether Dr. Smith had a distinguished relative who came from New York.

In the area of mental health, Mr. Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness, and Dr. Nathan Kline, director of research, Rockland State Hospital, Orangeburg, N.Y., made the presentation.



In the field of cancer, Dr. Sidney Farber, professor of pathology, Harvard Medical School, made the presentation.

In the field of neurological diseases and blindness, Dr. Houston Merritt, dean of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York City, made the presentation; and in the field of general medical sciences, Philip Handler, professor and chairman of the department of biochemistry of Duke University, made the presentation.

Mr. President, Senators who are interested in these matters can examine the record in this case and the testimony presented at the hearings; and I challenge any Senator, after doing that carefully, to argue that these advisory committees have in any case recommended extravagant appropriations for the particular areas in which they are experts. Indeed, I think the committee could perhaps be criticized, if it is to be criticized at all, although I would not criticize the committee—for having cut back as substantially as it did the amounts recommended by the advisory committees.

Therefore, I strongly support the committee's recommendations. Goodness knows, we need more general research and more cancer research and an increased program on mental health—for mental disease is probably the worst illness of all; and we know how important it is to have more research and better treatment of arthritis, heart disease, and metabolic disease, also of allergies and infectious diseases and in the area of neurology and blindness.

Mr. President, I close on this note: It has been said that fiscal responsibility requires us to make reductions in the amounts of the committee's recommendations—proposed for the benefit of those in our hospitals and for the benefit of those who wish to engage in these important fields of research to eliminate human misery. It has been said that this should be done in order to balance the budget. Mr. President, I am as much in favor of fiscal responsibility as is any other Member of the Senate. I believe the budget should be balanced; and I believe it will be balanced in the next fiscal year. But I do not want to balance the budget at the expense of the unemployed or those who suffer from disease. I do not want to balance the budget by cutting down on the funds for hospital construction. I want the budget balanced by seeing to it that those who are living high on expense accounts have that privilege curtailed, so that they and the corporations they serve pay their just share of taxes. I do not want to see the Federal Government pay 52 cents of every dollar required for the maintenance of private yachts which are said to have some bearing on private business activities. I want to see the budget balanced by closing tax loopholes and by seeing to it that those who receive dividends and interest have their taxes deducted at the source, just as those who live on wages have their taxes deducted at the source.

I believe that the policies of the Kennedy administration, which are getting our economy back on the road, and already have shown a substantial increase

in the gross national product, will in the end bring in somewhere in the neighborhood of \$10 billion of additional revenue in the next fiscal year; and that sum alone will be more than sufficient to take care of all the requirements for national defense and all the requirements of important activities such as those we now have under consideration.

But if that is not enough, and if cutting down on the tax chiselers is not enough, and if closing the tax loopholes is not enough, then I, too, am in favor of fiscal responsibility; and today I have cosponsored with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma the administrations bill to raise postal rates. The American people are asked to make sacrifices. I believe that those who are using the postal service as a subsidy should be among those who make the sacrifices. I believe that the American people should be prepared to pay another cent for first-class postage.

But if after having done all those things, we are in a position where it can be said that the budget is not being balanced, I, for one, would like to see the excess-profits tax reenacted, before we take these alleged savings out of the hides of the sick, the unfortunate, and the poor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I know the Senate is anxious to vote. I think I can sum up rather quickly my position on my amendments.

I am happy to have had the Senator from Pennsylvania comment on this situation.

I am happy to follow the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. He is always very frank, eloquent, and persuasive. The position he has taken on fiscal responsibility is 100 percent sound. There is one inaccuracy which he has implied in my position. I do not favor cutting back hospital construction. Nothing in my proposal would cut this back except to the budget request. The budget has proposed an increase not a cut. The program moves ahead. This is a budget of progress on the health front.

Although the Senator from Pennsylvania has called it the Eisenhower program, the fact is that the Kennedy administration has been in office 6 months. It has had ample opportunity to appear before the committee of the Senator from Alabama. I am chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. We have had requests from the administration. First they sought \$75 million in the authorization bill. Then they said they had no need for any additional funds. Then they changed their minds and said they needed \$525 million for the next 4 years which would be a much higher yearly amount than the committee had first expected. But it was the budget request.

When we have a man of the ability and force of Secretary Ribicoff in charge of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I think we can expect him to insist on appropriations which will be in compliance with his program and the President's program.

If we take a look at what the administration has requested, we will see this amendment does not cut back that program. As a matter of fact, the appropriation for one of the elements of the appropriation, general research in the field of medical science, goes from \$76 million in 1961 to \$95 million. But the committee's recommendation goes from \$95 million to \$140 million in 1 year.

I think, when an administration comes before Congress and states how much money it can use efficiently and how much it needs, it makes sense for a Member of the Senate to argue that we should not go above that amount in times like these. When the head of a department, particularly a department in this kind of administration, which has a heart and a very strong compassion for the individual, asks for a specific sum of money, I can see how the Congress might think it is an extravagant request. I do not think we should go higher. I do not see how a Cabinet head like Mr. Ribicoff can be expected to do an efficient job if he asks for a certain amount, and the Congress says, "No; you must use more money. We think you can use more money, and you must take it."

I think, with this kind of administration and that kind of Secretary, that is not responsible action on the part of Congress.

I wish to say one more thing before I conclude. I have been accused by the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] of believing in the sanctity of the budget. Of course, I do not believe in the sanctity of the budget. I have voted for increases and decreases in the past, and I will again.

But what is wrong with a Senator taking the President of the United States seriously? The President of the United States asked the Congress, and the distinguished Senator from Ohio read it into the record earlier, not to go above the budget requests. He asked the Congress to do that. Furthermore, what has happened in the last few weeks has presented this Nation with a real international crisis. The country is being asked to enormously increase its defense expenditures, by billions of dollars. We have started doing that. Under those circumstances, it makes sense for a Senator to try to keep a domestic appropriation bill within the amounts requested by the President.

What my amendment does is cutback the increases. So it does not follow the budget. It follows the budget only in keeping the requests to the levels asked by the President.

It has been argued that the President had no hearings or no opportunity to take a position. The President is very interested in this subject. No man in Government is more interested in this subject or more responsible in this field than is Secretary Ribicoff. This is his responsibility. There is no more important thing for him to do than come before the Congress and tell the Congress what he needs. He has told what he needs. What he has requested is exceeded by tens of millions of dollars in this bill.

This amendment will save \$297 million, which is sorely needed in our military effort, and sorely needed in the the foreign aid bill to come before the Senate shortly. This amendment is in compliance with what the President has asked.

I conclude by referring to the colloquy I had with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] on Saturday, when it was emphasized that this proposal was in accordance with the President's program. This amendment is an attempt to comply with the President's request.

It seems to me, to support the President, a vote of "yea" on this amendment will result in a saving of \$297 million. I yield the floor, and hope we can vote in the near future.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 67, as follows:

[No. 122]

YEAS—22

Bennett	Douglas	Proxmire
Bush	Dworshak	Thurmond
Byrd, Va.	Ellender	Tower
Capehart	Goldwater	Williams, Del.
Case, N.J.	Hickenlooper	Young, N. Dak.
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Young, Ohio
Cotton	Lausche	
Curtis	Mundt	

NAYS—67

Alken	Carlson	Hart
Anderson	Carroll	Hartke
Bartlett	Church	Hayden
Beall	Clark	Hickey
Bible	Dodd	Hill
Boggs	Engle	Hruska
Bridges	Ervin	Humphrey
Burdick	Fong	Jackson
Byrd, W. Va.	Fulbright	Javits
Cannon	Gruening	Johnston

Jordan	Miller	Schoeppel
Keating	Monroney	Scott
Kefauver	Morse	Smathers
Kuchel	Morton	Smith, Mass.
Long, Mo.	Moss	Smith, Maine
Long, Hawaii	Muskie	Sparkman
Long, La.	Neuberger	Stennis
Magnuson	Pastore	Symington
Mansfield	Pell	Talmadge
McCarthy	Prouty	Williams, N.J.
McGee	Randolph	Yarborough
McNamara	Robertson	
Metcalfe	Saltonstall	

NOT VOTING—11

Allott	Dirksen	McClellan
Butler	Eastland	Russell
Chavez	Gore	Wiley
Cooper	Kerr	

So Mr. PROXIMIRE's amendments, en bloc, were rejected.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "7-29-61—A," as modified, and I ask that the amendments as modified be stated.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendments of the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

**THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** On page 27, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "\$212,972,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$187,972,000", and on line 13, strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$125,000,000".

On page 32, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "\$140,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$95,341,000".

On page 33, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "\$160,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$117,167,000".

On page 33, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "\$125,570,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$88,324,000".

On page 33, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$160,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$97,073,000".

On page 34, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$13,933,000".

On page 34, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$90,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$68,740,000".

On page 34, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$48,322,000".

On page 35, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$80,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$54,100,000".

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator desire that the amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. BUSH. No, seriatim. I shall call the amendments up separately, one after the other. However, I shall not call them up in the order in which they appear on the printed amendments, but will specify after my remarks which amendment I desire to have called up.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Which amendment does the Senator wish to call up first?

Mr. BUSH. The first amendment will be the one shown on line 3 of the amendments.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

**THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** On page 32, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "\$140,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$95,341,000".

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall address myself briefly to the subject of the amendments, and then ask for a yeas-and-nays vote on some of the amendments, possibly all, depending upon how we proceed in the consideration of the amendments.

Mr. President, my amendments offer the Senate an opportunity to help President Kennedy achieve the fiscal responsibility in our National Government which will be required to offset, in part, the heavy additional expenditures he has requested for defense and space exploration.

Since January, the President has called for an addition of \$6 billion to the defense budget. On yesterday, the Senate approved, as part of the independent offices appropriation bill, a \$549 million downpayment on a \$20 billion project to place a man on the moon and return him safely within the next decade.

In urging these increased expenditures for defense and for space exploration, the President stressed the need for keeping within his budget estimates for other programs.

In his May 25 message before a joint session of the Congress, President Kennedy appealed to members "to refrain from adding funds or programs, desirable as they may be, to the budget."

Again, in his television and radio address to the Nation on July 26, the President said:

We must keep down all expenditures not thoroughly justified in budget requests.

Mr. President, my amendments would eliminate from H.R. 7035 \$277,670,000 which have not been—to use President Kennedy's own words—"thoroughly justified in budget requests." These expenditures were added to the bill in excess of the President's requests, and in opposition to the wishes of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the distinguished former Governor of my State, Abraham Ribicoff.

I have placed in the RECORD, the Secretary's letter urging the committee not to exceed the President's requests, and I quote the following paragraph:

The budget estimates as amended by the President represented a sound plan to permit marked improvement in the health, education and welfare programs administered by this Department. This plan reflected a careful consideration of the need for fiscal prudence and of the proportion of the total budget resources which should be applied to health, education and welfare activities.

This is a responsible statement by a responsible man, who has dealt with these problems in a State which has been progressive in connection with such matters.

Despite the appeals of the President and the Secretary, the Committee on Appropriations has added almost \$278 million to the bill in additional appropriations for hospital construction and for the National Institutes of Health. My amendment proposes to eliminate those increases beyond the President's requests.

It is difficult to offer, and to vote for amendments which will reduce appropriations labeled as designed to help the sick, the halt, and the blind and for



research which can lead to better health for all our people.

One runs the risk of being pictured as hard-hearted—an old Scrooge who would save money at the expense of those in distress.

People who confuse prodigality with liberality express the view that any attempt to reduce appropriations for these purposes is made with bad motives.

An example is an editorial in today's Washington Post under the headline "The Unkindest Cut," from which I quote the following paragraph:

A case in point is the fight in the Senate over the \$5.1 billion appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Those to whom the very name of the Department is anathema seem to feel that getting tough with Mr. Khrushchev requires a cracking down on the people of the United States. Their proposed economies would impair a number of existing programs, including the medical research conducted by the Public Health Service.

I would say that there is nothing in the amendments which are now before the Senate which would have that effect.

Mr. President, the writer of that editorial is guilty of the fuzzy-minded thinking which confuses prodigality with liberality. He obviously was unaware of the fact that not only does the bill ex-

ceed by almost \$278 million the amounts President Kennedy requested for the items in question, but it also contains far more than the Department itself believes it could spend wisely during the next fiscal year.

In its initial requests to the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of HEW submitted requests for these items which totaled \$883,409,000. This amount is approximately \$165 million below the total approved by the committee.

Executive departments, and HEW is no exception, are not notoriously reluctant to ask the Budget Bureau for as much money as they think they can spend efficiently. Yet, the committee proposes to give the Department \$165 million more than the Department itself thinks it can spend wisely.

The Budget Bureau, acting under President Kennedy's orders, reduced the Department's requests to \$770,972,000, and that is the amount which would be provided if my amendment is adopted by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Certain appropriations of Public Health Service, NIH—Summary of Department, President, and Congress budget estimates, fiscal year 1962*

	Department estimate to Bureau of Budget <sup>1</sup>	President's budget (Bureau of Budget) <sup>1</sup>	House allowance	Senate bill	Senate bill increased over—	
					Department estimate	President's budget
Public Health Service: Hospital Construction Act...	\$188,345,000	\$187,972,000	\$187,972,000	\$212,972,000	\$24,627,000	\$25,000,000
NIH:						
General research.....	127,638,000	95,341,000	119,275,000	140,000,000	12,362,000	44,659,000
National Cancer Institute.....	129,945,000	117,167,000	125,672,000	160,000,000	30,055,000	42,833,000
Mental health.....	99,917,000	88,324,000	92,182,000	125,570,000	25,653,000	37,246,000
National Heart Institute.....	116,621,000	97,073,000	105,723,000	160,100,000	43,479,000	63,027,000
National Institute of Dental Health.....	16,446,000	13,933,000	14,681,000	20,000,000	3,554,000	6,067,000
Arthritis and metabolic diseases.....	82,234,000	68,740,000	73,661,000	90,000,000	7,766,000	21,260,000
Allergy and infectious diseases.....	57,960,000	48,322,000	52,182,000	60,000,000	2,040,000	11,678,000
Neurology and blindness.....	64,303,000	54,100,000	57,624,000	80,000,000	15,697,000	25,900,000
Total.....	883,409,000	770,972,000	828,972,000	1,048,642,000	165,233,000	277,670,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes all 1962 amendments.

Sources: P. 128 of House hearings, Senate and House reports on bill; and H.R. 7035.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I should like to make my remarks first without interruption. Then I shall be glad to yield, if time permits.

Mr. President, the President of the United States is a compassionate man. When a Senator, John F. Kennedy served on a committee which considers these matters under its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The President is fully aware of the needs in this field. He has dealt with them. So is the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a compassionate man. I know that from my own experience. They are anxious to provide enough funds for the humanitarian purposes of the activities in question.

And what does Secretary Ribicoff say? He has told us this:

The budget estimates as amended by the President represented a sound plan to permit marked improvement in the health, education, and welfare programs administered by this Department.

Speaking specifically of the budget for the National Institutes of Health, Secretary Ribicoff had this to say in his letter to the subcommittee:

This budget was given most careful consideration by the President in relation to other elements of the budget and a recommendation was made which would provide for substantial forward progress in the field of medical research. The recommendation took account of other competing demands upon the budget and the rapid progress which has occurred in medical research in recent years.

The writer of the editorial in today's Washington Post has no basis for the statement that the economies proposed in my amendment "would impair a number of existing programs, including the medical research conducted by the Public Health Service."

Mr. President, the economies proposed in my amendment are the economies proposed by the President of the United States.

They are the economies sponsored by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

They are economies designed to provide a budget which, in Secretary Ribicoff's words, will "provide for substantial forward progress in the field of medical research."

They are economies intended to respond to the President's appeal to Members of Congress—and I again quote his exact words:

To refrain from adding funds or programs, desirable as they may be, to the budget.

They are economies offered in the spirit of the President's admonition in his May 25 message:

Our security and progress cannot be cheaply purchased; and their price must be found in what we all forgo as well as what we all must pay.

Mr. President, I do not like to oppose the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the other able and distinguished members of his subcommittee, and ask them to forgo the additional expenditures they have proposed for the items affected by my amendment. I consider it an unpleasant task to do it.

When the Eisenhower administration was in office, I supported the senior Senator from Alabama in his efforts to obtain additional funds for medical research, especially in the important area of basic research, which I felt had been too long neglected. Indeed, I believe that it is being neglected again to some extent in some fields. Our efforts were successful, and funds for these purposes have steadily increased over the years.

I do not criticize the able Senator, nor any of the able and distinguished Senators who serve on the Appropriations Committee, for their consideration of the bill was completed before President Kennedy made his sober and impressive address to the Nation on the Berlin crisis and our global conflict with Communist imperialism.

In view of that address, and the President's request in it for \$3.5 billion in additional defense spending, I appeal to them for reconsideration of the items which are \$277,670,000 in excess of the President's own requests.

And I appeal to the Senate to respond to the President's appeal for fiscal responsibility, expressed in his May 25 message as follows:

If the budget now increased by the needs of our security is to be held to manageable proportions—if we are to preserve our fiscal integrity and world confidence in the dollar—it will be necessary to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards.

Mr. President, the need for fiscal responsibility is even greater than it was

when the President spoke those words on May 25.

President Kennedy himself now estimates the deficit for the current fiscal year at more than \$5 billion. Many Members of Congress, including myself, believe it will be much higher, ranging upward of \$7 billion, and I have heard competent estimates that it might go as high as \$10 billion.

Mr. President, a budget deficit of that size would endanger—and again I use the words of President Kennedy “our fiscal integrity and world confidence in the dollar.”

A budget deficit of those proportions would rekindle the fires of inflation, and impair the credit of the United States upon which our national security and the security of the entire free world ultimately depends.

Inflationary forces, if they are set loose again, would have a very bad effect upon the very items about which we are speaking, and nothing is more likely to set them loose than deficits in the budget of the Federal Government. One of the problems we face is the high cost of medical care and the high cost of hospital service. If inflationary forces are put to work again through a budget deficit, we shall simply be fanning the fire and compounding the difficulty which we are trying to solve.

Mr. President, let us not add to that deficit in our action on the bill now before the Senate. By the adoption of my amendment, we can demonstrate to the President, to the country, and to the world, that we have heeded his appeal to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards.

Mr. President, I should say that while I voted to support the Proxmire amendment, the amendment contained some items which, if they had been considered separately, I would have voted against. I think my amendment will present the issue point-by-point, in a way in which Senators can judge for themselves whether the individual items are desirable increases over the budget estimates or not.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, first I commend the Senator from Connecticut for the way in which he has approached this subject. It seems to me that this is the most sensible way in which to proceed, rather than by a catchall amendment, such as that proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin.

There were a number of items in the Proxmire amendment which I thought should be cut in light of the President's statement on Berlin, from which the Senator from Connecticut has just quoted. However, I felt constrained to vote against the Proxmire amendment because it was such a complete and sweeping proposition, covering every item in the entire bill before us. I thought it was a mistake to offer the amendment in this form. Although I

sought to have the amendment divided, I found that unanimous consent had already been granted to consider the amendments en bloc earlier in the debate this afternoon.

Again, I commend the Senator from Connecticut for the way in which he is approaching the problem.

Is it not a fact that on this specific amendment, if it is accepted, the appropriation will still be some \$20 million above the appropriation for last year?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has the table; I am certain he is correct.

Mr. KEATING. According to the information I have, the 1961 appropriation was \$76,695,000. The Senator from Connecticut by his amendment seeks to restore the 1962 budget estimate, which is \$95,341,000.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. This is almost \$20 million above the appropriation of last year.

Mr. BUSH. That is absolutely correct. I am glad the Senator from New York has pointed that out.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me that this gives added impetus to the argument which the Senator from Connecticut has so forcefully made.

Mr. BUSH. What is being asked for in the bill is \$63 million more than the appropriation of 1961 and \$44 million above the budget estimate for this year. So it seems to me that my amendment is quite in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that the amount allocated for general research and activities in the last fiscal year was \$76 million?

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The President requested \$95,341,000.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senate committee recommends \$140 million.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, the Senate committee recommends \$44,659,000 above the President's request.

Mr. BUSH. That is so; the Senator is correct. It is an increase of almost 50 percent, or mighty close to it—45 percent, perhaps.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the date of the letter, from which the Senator from Connecticut read, written by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Mr. BUSH. I shall have to look for it in the hearings.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am reading from the letter on page 1418.

Mr. BUSH. That is where the Senator will find it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is dated May 22, 1961.

Mr. BUSH. May 22 is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not read the letter; but would the Senator from Connecticut read the pertinent parts, in which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare urged that the com-

mittee adhere to the recommendations made by the President?

Mr. BUSH. Possibly the Senator from Ohio has left the Chamber when I commented on the letter before. I shall read the pertinent part:

The budget estimates as amended by the President represented a sound plan to permit marked improvement in the health, education, and welfare programs administered by this Department.

Under the heading “National Institutes of Health,” the letter reads:

This budget was given most careful consideration by the President in relation to other elements of the budget and a recommendation was made which would provide for substantial forward progress in the field of medical research. The recommendation took account of other competing demands upon the budget and the rapid progress which has occurred in medical research in recent years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So far as the record is concerned, as shown by the testimony, has there been any abandonment of the position taken by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in that letter?

Mr. BUSH. I am not aware of any abandonment at all. The letter represents the position of the administration. So far as I know, there has been no advice that has come to the Senate which has changed the Secretary's position at all. I only point out that the administration has taken the position that the national scene has changed somewhat, and the President himself has called upon us again, publicly, in his most recent speech, for restraint in these matters; to restrain ourselves from breaking the barriers of the budget with programs which go beyond his own requests.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut with respect to this proposition: Have we not a right to assume, when the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare stated that this was a sound, well thought out plan to make marked progress by the increased allocation recommended, that the administration gave consideration to what sums could be prudently spent?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is absolutely correct. Neither the President nor the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is a newcomer to political life. The President was a distinguished Member of this body for 8 years.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is a former Governor of my State and a former Member of the House of Representatives. He was the Governor of a State which has had a distinguished record in pioneering in the field of health, education, and welfare.

So when we listen to their admonitions, I think we are listening to a warning and advice from experienced men, who know something about the field we are discussing, and also know something about Congress and the needs of the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question of the chairman of the committee?



Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield for that purpose, if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask whether there has been any abandonment of the position taken by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and whether there has been a change. If there has been one, where is it set forth in the record?

Mr. HILL. If I am able to obtain an opportunity to speak again, I will go into that question.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield briefly to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I ask whether I correctly understood the Senator to say that the reduction he proposes in the appropriations in this area of the bill would not result in the elimination of any specific projects?

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. If this additional money is appropriated, is it believed that we might find that it would be wasted because we do not have the facilities or the trained personnel to use it?

Mr. BUSH. I stated the matter in another way. The Secretary of this Department has indicated that his recommendations encompass all that he believes can be usefully employed during this fiscal year. Therefore, I think the Senator's conclusion may be justified.

But I believe that the Secretary has studied this problem very closely, and so has the President. Both of them are very experienced; and they believe they have made budget recommendations for all that is necessary, and that because of the national needs and the relationship of this part of the budget to others, this program is a very sound one which will permit us to move forward, particularly in the field of health and medical research.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to make a brief statement at this point, and then ask a question either of the Senator from Connecticut or of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BUSH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I certainly hope this amendment will be adopted. I intend to support it. I believe that the reasons advanced by the Senator from Connecticut are exceedingly sound. For example, the Senator made the point that if this effort is successful, it will help the President get on with the national defense program which we have been asked to put into effect.

In this connection, in the July 31 issue of the Washington Daily News there appeared an excellent article by Henry J. Taylor. In the course of the article he wrote:

Great help would come to the President's hallowed task by postponing or abandoning other programs which, while desirable or popular, are not essential.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, July 31, 1961]

#### IN RESPONSE TO KENNEDY

(By Henry J. Taylor)

On ending his report to the Nation about Berlin, President Kennedy said he had found the burdens of the Presidency even greater than he thought when he ran for office. He asked for suggestions and for the public to help him.

The humbleness in this plea is enormously appealing and the sincerity unquestionable. "To know," the Bible calls it; a profoundly meaningful word.

Progressively fighting for the right, as the President is, is the noblest effort the world affords, and I do not like to put things too strongly, but I believe that the greatest help the President, and therefore our Nation, can receive is within his own grasp and at his command.

Surely it must begin with the abandonment of inexperienced and immature young associates who are his closest official advisers in the White House. They are intellectuals, fresh from college faculties, but not one has had any experience in government or equally large affairs or been tested in anything like the burdens to which the President himself refers.

Next, great help will flow to him when, in so properly calling for sacrifices, he himself takes this flag out front. The basic sacrifice any official can make—and it is soon recognized by the public—is not to play politics with the people's money, with policies, with decisions, with appointments, or anything else, and to forget the next election. Yet it is clear that politics as usual, political spending as usual, and all the casting about for reelection is in practice from the White House down.

Great help would come to the President's hallowed task by postponing or abandoning other programs which, while desirable or popular, are not essential. Yet, instead, added programs are being sponsored without apparent heed to the cost of it all or how we are to pay for the total load, except through a deficit without tears.

The weapon Russia wants most is an inflated and unstable America. And little separates the Russian sword from our throat. We are faced by a problem of priorities in spending. We need an immediate decision on where to proceed and where to hold back. Not a better life, but humanity in its vastest meaning, is at stake.

It will be profoundly helpful to the President if he attempts to redeem to the American people the promises made and then contradicted or not kept, and at the same time he speaks no word that exceeds our Government's willingness and capacity to act, as in the tragedy of the unsupported warnings to Russia regarding Cuba and Laos. Nothing is so costly to our authority in the world, and therefore to peace, as eloquence without performance.

Thus, a mass of uneasy thoughts burst in today. But the American people would recognize a change in course very fast and respond with a roar of approval, support and allegiance. Otherwise, any President must face a division between those who believe with their ears and those who believe with their eyes. And to force that unwanted division on us would be unworthy of this hour.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has stated that we must do something to curb in-

flation. In yesterday's Washington Daily News appeared an article written by Lyle C. Wilson, who pointed out what has happened to the American dollar in recent years. He pointed out that in 1939, President Roosevelt had a dollar which was worth 100 cents; that in 1945, President Truman had a dollar which was worth only 79 cents; that at the beginning of President Eisenhower's term, the dollar had dropped to 52 cents; and that at the end of President Eisenhower's term the dollar had fallen to 46 cents.

Mr. President, if we continue at this rate, Mr. Wilson prophesies that it will not be very long before we shall have what we can call a "two-bit" dollar.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Mr. Wilson be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE SHRINKING DOLLAR

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The most important dollar ever inherited by John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the U.S. "buck" bequeathed to him by the Eisenhower administration.

That dollar was a "beat up" bit of paper which had been inherited by Dwight D. Eisenhower from Harry S. Truman. H.S.T. got it from F.D.R.

To understand the importance of this presidential dollar, it is necessary to agree on the moment of time when this dollar was in good health and capable of buying 100 cents worth of goods and services. The Senate Finance Committee fixes this moment of time in the year 1939. This is an arbitrary choice but a good one.

It puts the dollar to the severest test of the past 22 years. So it is that F.D.R. in 1939 had in his wallet a U.S. dollar worth 100 cents. Harry S. Truman inherited that dollar along with the Presidency in 1945. It had shrunk by then in value to less than 79 cents.

Conservative minded citizens became alarmed. Everybody's dollar had shrunk in pace with the dollar in F.D.R.'s pocket. The prudent family man with a savings account, bonds, or a life insurance policy had suffered in 6 years at least a 21 percent levy on his capital. This probably represented the grandest larceny of all time. There was more to come.

When Harry S. Truman handed the presidential dollar on to Dwight D. Eisenhower that U.S. "buck" was worth about 52 cents. F.D.R. and Mr. Truman were big spenders. Each had a war in his lap, however, and much of the "dollar-busting" deficit spending sponsored by those two Presidents was for survival defense.

General Eisenhower was a big time spender, too, and he did not stop the rotting of the U.S. dollar. General Eisenhower slowed the disease, however, and handed over to John F. Kennedy a dollar worth about 46 cents. That is the way it has been.

F.D.R.'s healthy 1939 dollar is gravely ill. The illness has developed in step with a long and almost uninterrupted series of deficit years in the operation of the U.S. Government. These deficits require enormous borrowing to pay Government bills. There has been a relentless growth of the national debt toward \$300 billion, an incomprehensible figure.

This deficit spending seems to have been bad medicine for the ailing U.S. dollar. President Kennedy and Treasury Secretary

C. Douglas Dillon evidently believe this is good medicine. They will dose the dollar with a \$7 billion deficit this year. The President needs a great lot of new defense money and he plans to borrow that and to borrow more for other purposes.

He may ask for higher taxes next January. But he is not talking in terms of cutting Government costs and preventing deficit spending by economy in postponable non-defense areas. Those are politically sensitive areas, untouchable except at great political risk.

The facts of simple arithmetic suggest something which should jolt all deficit spenders, past and present. From 1939 to 1961, inclusive, the dollar lost purchasing power at the rate of 2.4 cents a year. At that rate, if Mr. Kennedy served two terms, he would pass on to the next President a dollar worth about 27 cents. "Two-bit" dollar, here we come.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have a question to ask. The Senator from Connecticut has pointed out many statements made by the President in asking for prudent fiscal spending and in asking for the deletion of items which are desirable but are not absolutely necessary. We have heard many statements along that line. However, I have not heard or seen one statement in which the President has requested a cut-back on a specific project.

So I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut and also the Senator from Alabama whether the President has seen fit to make known his desire that this specific item be reduced to the amount he said was necessary at the time when he submitted the budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall discuss the President's position on this question when I obtain the floor in my own time. At that time I shall make the matter clear to the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. I shall look forward to having that point discussed, because I believe it very important that the President wield the tremendous influence of his office in asking the Congress to cut back on specific projects. It is not sufficient just to say, "We want prudent fiscal spending." We must get down to specifics.

Here is a \$44 million specific which ties in with the President's request; and no one can convince me that a telephone call from the White House to the proper Members of the Senate could not result in having this cut back at once.

The Senator from Connecticut has pointed out the policy enunciated by the President; and I hope this amendment will be adopted, because it is a specific effort to tie in with the President's policy.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator suggesting that the fate of this Republic will depend on making a cut in the amount for this item?

Mr. MILLER. I suggest that now that the President has requested prudent fiscal standards of spending and the deletion of items which are not strictly essential, there is no time better than the present one to start on that course.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from Iowa know that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has devoted 3 full months to the investigation of these items, and knows more about them than does any other Member of the Senate or, I dare say, any Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MILLER. I do not care whether the Senator from Alabama has devoted a year to this subject. Some changes have occurred within the past 30 days; in fact, within the last 2 weeks there have been changes which have put our country on almost a semimobilization status. Many assumptions which I am sure the Senator from Alabama took into account in his studies have now gone by the board.

Mr. PASTORE. But what makes the Senator from Iowa feel that the safety of our great country depends on sacrificing the national health program? Why is it not in the interest of the safety of the country to take steps to eradicate heart disease, cancer, and the other serious diseases which so severely affect the people of the United States?

Mr. MILLER. I am entirely in favor of action in those areas, and I am sure the Senator from Connecticut takes the same position. He only asks that this particular item be reduced to \$76 million, which is the amount the President requested when he sent us his budget.

Mr. PASTORE. Does not the Senator from Iowa realize that this committee report is a unanimous one—by both the subcommittee and the full committee?

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask when the report was made.

Mr. PASTORE. It was made at the time when the bill was reported to the Senate. The subcommittee was unanimous in this recommendation, and so was the full committee. But now two Senators who have not heard one of the witnesses, say we are sacrificing the security of the United States if we do not cut this budget.

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask the date when those recommendations were made.

Mr. PASTORE. The bill was reported last Tuesday.

Mr. MILLER. I point out that that very night the President of the United States asked us, in effect, to put the country on a semimobilization basis. That is quite a change from the conditions under which the committee's recommendations were made.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island subscribes to that, but the Senator from Iowa is creating the impression on the floor of the Senate that the enactment of these very health programs disturbs the peace and security of the country. I realize we can do both and have both. I do not think the fate of this Republic depends on our reducing this item this afternoon. I realize that we must cut out all nonessential spending, but I do not think it is nonessential to spend for the health of our people.

Mr. MILLER. The health of our people will not be improved one bit if we are to squander money on projects which have not even been established. The Senator from Connecticut has said no

project will be abandoned, because there are no trained personnel available to utilize these facilities. Only a certain amount of money can be spent on a project. I am sure the President took these factors into account when he made his request.

Mr. PASTORE. May I be so impertinent as to ask my colleague if he read the hearings on this last item? Has he read the hearings?

Mr. MILLER. May I ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether he read the President's speech the other night?

Mr. PASTORE. I certainly did, but the President never recommended reducing funds for cancer and other health research.

Mr. BUSH. The President said we must keep down all expenditures.

Mr. PASTORE. All nonessential expenditures.

Mr. BUSH. He said we must keep down all expenditures not thoroughly justified in budget requests. That is what President Kennedy said. The only difference between my very respected friend from Rhode Island and myself is that I believe the President means what he said.

Mr. PASTORE. I think so, too, non-essential expenditures.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has said the Department is being treated badly if we do not accept the committee's recommendations. I pointed out a little while ago that the appropriation for 1961 was \$76 million for the item under discussion, and the estimate for 1962 by the Department, which we are asked to cut back, is \$95 million—at least \$20 million above the \$76 million. So we are not starving the Department on that item.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. BUSH. I do not have the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. I think the Senator has the floor, because the Senator from Iowa has taken his seat.

Mr. MILLER. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that over the past 5 or 10 years, each year the amount has been greater than for the year before; and that each year we have heard it said on the floor of the Senate that we cannot absorb the money, that we do not have the facilities or personnel available? Yet, in each subsequent year, the budget has begun where the Senate has ended. Year after year we have found that if it had not been for the Senate and the House, the particular items for these programs would have been starved.

Mr. BUSH. The administration is not asking us to starve these items. It has recommended an amount of \$20 million above the 1961 level. The committee is asking for an increase of \$63 million above the appropriation for 1961, an increase of 80 or 90 percent, or on that order of magnitude, and \$44 million or \$45 million above the estimates by the budget and requests of the President.

My point is that the administration has taken good care of this item. It has moved ahead with a very big increase.



My feeling in offering the amendment is that we ought to stand with the President.

Mr. PASTORE. I have no fault to find with the position of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. I think he has a perfect right to state his point of view, as we have done on this side. But what I do protest, as a member of the subcommittee, after the committee has acted unanimously, is having a Senator suggest on the floor that an increase in these items jeopardizes the security of the Nation. It does not do that at all. If a Senator wants to indulge in these clichés and platitudes, it is all right with me. But the implication that those who voted for this increase are doing so at the risk of the security of the country, I protest, because it is not true, and it is offensive to every member of the committee.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator knows perfectly well that I meant no offense to the members of the committee, and when he tries to impute to me that charge—

Mr. PASTORE. Those were the statements that were made.

Mr. BUSH. Just a minute. I yielded to the Senator. Let me continue. I think any Senator has a right to differ with a committee report, and I think he has a special right and a duty when he is in defense of the President of the United States and a member of the Cabinet, both of whom the Senator from Connecticut knows very well and whom he considers competent in this field. I do not think any Senator should take offense. It seems to me in the last 9 years I have seen the Senator from Rhode Island take issue with committee reports and take issue with the former President of the United States. I have never criticized him for that. I do not think anybody has been offended by it.

I do not wish to pursue this except to say that all I am doing is urging members of the Appropriations Subcommittee to reconsider, in the light of the President's recent appeal. I believe a Senator has a right to support the President if he thinks he is right. That is all I am trying to do.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF FULBRIGHT ACT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, just before the preceding rollcall, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and I returned from a very happy ceremony at the White House. I think it is appropriate, during a discussion of the legislation involving appropriations on health, education, and welfare, to call attention to the purpose of that ceremony, which was to commemorate the 15th year of the signing of the Fulbright Act.

As Members of the Senate know, the original Fulbright Act set in motion an

exchange program which has evolved, developed, and grown to considerable size and magnitude.

I was happy to be among those at the ceremony, at which the President spoke pleasantly, and very appropriately, about the contributions of the exchange program in the area of protecting the security of America.

I think our colleagues will be pleased to learn that two of our former associates were invited to the ceremony, Senator Alexander Smith, coauthor of the Smith-Mundt Act, which has operated in conjunction with the Fulbright Act in this field, and Senator Joseph O'Mahoney, of the State of Wyoming, who was there, and, to the pleasant surprise of all of us, was called upon by the President for a few informal remarks, which he made for the radio and television audience, as well as the people gathered in the Rose Garden for this pleasant ceremony.

Senator O'Mahoney exhibited his old fire and aptitude, and pointed out that in these exchange programs, as of now, we should concentrate more on bringing to this country students, leaders, and scholars from Latin America, as against Western European countries, from which countries so many have been coming in the past few years.

I thought, commemorating as it did the 15th anniversary of the Fulbright Act, it was worthwhile to call this ceremony to the attention of the Senate.

As Members of the Senate know, I do not always agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on all matters of public policy, but there has never been any disagreement between us on the importance of the exchange programs and what they mean to the preservation of the security of this country. The Fulbright program and the Smith-Mundt programs have worked together hand in glove, most effectively, for well over a dozen years.

In addition to the remarks made by the President and those made by former Senator O'Mahoney, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] recalled how this program began, in its infancy, with only a few exchanges and how, down through the years which have intervened since the 2 programs have come to work together as companion activities—the Fulbright Act and the Smith-Mundt Act—more than 50,000 students and scholars have been brought to this country and exchanged overseas, in helping to bring together a meeting of the minds of people from different countries.

The whole concept of the exchange program I think is born out of the concept of the ancient civilization of Japan, from whence came a philosopher who at one time said, "The man you don't like is the man you don't know." The exchange process is an effort to encourage people to know each other in the conviction that if they come to know each other they will like each other, regardless of differences in types of government, in color, in creed, or in ways of life.

I should like to add for the RECORD the fact that in addition to those whose

names I have mentioned, in attendance at the ceremony also was William Benton, another former Senator, remembered primarily because of his service as Assistant Secretary of State at the time the exchange programs were being enacted.

Others present were former Assistant Secretary Ed Barrett, in charge of the program for some time; former Representative Carter Manasco of Alabama; Representative John Rooney, of New York, who heads the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations which deals with this particular program; Representative Walter Judd, of Minnesota, who helped in the legislative craftsmanship of the program; and Walter Reynolds and Oscar Cox, who at the time were associated in the movement to bring the bills to passage.

I did not think we should let the ceremony or anniversary pass unnoticed, and I wished to be among those publicly congratulating the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for his part in sponsoring legislation which resulted in this commemorative ceremony so rightfully dedicated to that purpose at the White House today.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we have heard much this afternoon about the President of the United States. Surely no one has greater respect for the President of the United States than I. I served for 8 years with him on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

As the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island stated a few minutes ago, no Senator worked more assiduously or tirelessly than did the former Senator from Massachusetts, but it happens that he was not a member of the Appropriations Committee. Therefore, it was not his fortune to sit in on the hearings on these appropriation bills and to consider the matters we have been discussing this afternoon in regard to the appropriations for the various health activities.

On the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare our President was not a member of the subcommittee of the committee which dealt with health legislation. His time was, to a very large extent, consumed by his duties as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Therefore, as a Member of this body he was not on any committee which gave him any particular opportunity to hear testimony, to examine witnesses, and to pass upon many health problems, some of which we have before us this afternoon for decision.

Speaking at Warm Springs, Ga., last fall, in October 1960, our President made this statement:

We must provide long-term grants for increased medical research, including basic research.

He added:

What has already been accomplished in polio and tuberculosis shows what might soon be accomplished for cancer, mental illness, arteriosclerosis, and new ways of prolonging man's productive days instead of just prolonging his life. All of this and more is underway.

Then the President added the sentence:

But now we must do more.

The last word from the President was Tuesday evening, a week ago tonight. In his report to the people of the United States and statement to the world he made this declaration:

While all of these efforts go on, we must not be diverted from our total responsibilities, from other dangers, from other tasks.

In other words, while we are building up our Armed Forces, carrying on our diplomatic negotiations, we must not be diverted from our total responsibilities, from other dangers, and from other tasks.

If new threats in Berlin or elsewhere should cause us to weaken our program of assistance to the developing nations who are also under heavy pressure from the same source, or to halt our efforts for realistic disarmament, or to disrupt or slow down our economy, or to neglect the education of our children, then those threats will surely be the most successful and least costly maneuver in Communist history.

Then our President added:

For we can afford all these efforts, and more.

If there is any one effort in the name of the defense of the United States which we can well afford, it is the effort for the health and physical strength and physical capabilities of our people.

I suppose most of us have let slip the fact that during the administration of President Eisenhower there was a Ginsberg report. A careful study was made of our manpower and of our military situation. The report spoke of the lost divisions, of the lost fighting men—of 5.2 million American fighting men rejected during World War II at the induction stations of selective service, or discharged from military service because of some physical disability or some physical impairment or because of some disease or, in some instances, those men who died in the service as the result of these physical disabilities or diseases.

I read a portion of that report:

What was the military manpower loss in World War II because of heart disease?

Three hundred seventeen thousand and five hundred men . . . were rejected because of heart disease.

Eighty thousand men were given disability discharges from military service or died in military service from heart disease during the war years.

This manpower loss from heart disease . . . would have been sufficient to man 27 Army divisions.

What are we talking about today? As well as the health of the people of the United States, we are talking about the strength of the manpower of the United States which means the strength of our Nation.

What are the rejections under Selective Service today because of these physical disabilities and diseases? I hold in my hand, Mr. President, a copy of the Washington Evening Star for 3 days ago, Friday, July 28, 1961.

On page A-6 of that newspaper I found the story by the Associated Press which is captioned "No Tightening Seen in Draft Deferment." The article goes on to state that the deferment question may become more pressing, especially if draft rejections for physical or mental reasons continue at the current rate of 40 to 50 percent of those examined.

In other words, today, 40 to 50 percent of the young men of this Nation who are called up for service under our Selective Service System must be rejected because of physical or mental disability. On the question of defense with reference to the bill, that rate of rejection is the challenge which confronts us. We must seek to find the cause, cure, and prevention of these diseases so that when we call up young men, 40 to 50 percent of them will not have to be rejected for the service of their country. What could be more important than this very subject? We are thinking in terms of the defense of our country. Nothing is more important than the strength and physical capabilities of our manpower.

As has been pointed out today, the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations spent many hours and days listening to the testimony of some of the most outstanding and distinguished doctors and biological scientists in the country.

On the subject of cancer we heard from Dr. Isidor S. Ravdin. Senators will recall that Dr. Ravdin is the outstanding surgeon who was brought down to Washington at the time President Eisenhower had his attack of ileitis. Dr. Ravdin was the president of the American Surgical Association, the most select organization of surgeons in the world. Its membership is limited to 225 surgeons in the United States. He is chairman of the Board of Regents of the American College of Surgeons.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Did the distinguished doctor recommend that the Senate adhere to the budget estimate or increase it?

Mr. HILL. He recommended that we go considerably over the budget estimate. In fact, he recommended that we go to a figure of \$190 million. Both he and Dr. Farber, who testified at the same time, said to us:

We have asked you for \$190 million, but we would like to make it \$100 million more. We could assure you that the additional \$100 million would be wisely, and profitably spent.

We had before us Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, professor of surgery and chairman of the Department of Surgery of

Baylor University, College of Medicine. He is the man who did the pioneering in heart operations.

He removes an old aorta, the large blood vessel that carries blood from the heart, and inserts plastic tubing in lieu of that blood vessel. We know that if that vessel is impaired and something is not done, the patient will die.

Dr. DeBakey brought before our committee Mr. Nat T. Winston, of Johnson City, Tenn. He is president of the Home Federal Savings & Loan Association. Mr. Winston told us a story of how Dr. DeBakey took out his right carotid artery, the big vessel which carries blood to the brain, and inserted a plastic tube in lieu of that carotid artery. He then found that there was impairment of the left carotid artery. He removed that and inserted plastic instead of that artery.

A short time after Mr. Winston was having trouble with his legs. His circulation was growing slower and slower all the time. He was reaching the point at which he could not walk. As a result, Mr. Winston now has 4½ feet of plastic material in his body in lieu of the blood vessels that mother nature put there to start with.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Did Dr. DeBakey recommend that we adhere to the budget estimate or increase it?

Mr. HILL. He not only recommended that we adhere to the budget estimate, but also that we go far over the budget estimate.

Dr. DeBakey was joined in his recommendation by a very distinguished doctor, scientist, and researcher from Harvard University, Dr. Frederick J. Stare. They joined in urging us to go far over the budget estimate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sorry that I was absent from the Chamber. The Senator may have mentioned this subject. If he has not, I believe it is important for him to tell the Senate that the discovery of the transplant of the main blood vessel to the brain would enable medical science to operate in operations that formerly were fatal in a high percentage of cases. The disability was thought to be due to difficulty in the blood vessels within the brain. The discovery and work that was done have turned up the information that a great portion of these cases, which were formerly thought to be brain injuries, have now turned out to require a relatively simple transplant of the main artery carrying the blood to the brain.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. Through these programs, to which the Senator from Oklahoma has made such a great contribution, discovery has been made that 40 percent of the strokes which people have had, and which we thought came from some rupture of a blood vessel in the brain—which is enclosed, as you know, by the skull and is almost impossible to get to—have come



from the blood vessels down in the neck or even as far down as the blood vessels in the lungs.

When a blood vessel in the neck or in the lungs is impaired or ruptured, the doctor can now go in and correct the condition, due to the discoveries which have been made as a result of health research programs. The ruptured or impaired blood vessel is removed and a plastic tube is inserted in place of the vessel.

That development is what we are talking about today. I said a little earlier—and I shall repeat my statement because I do not think many of the Senators now present in the Chamber were here at that time—when we speak about the heart we should remember that the medical and biological sciences have joined hands with electronics and the science of mechanism. They have devised what they call a pacemaker, which is a small machine or mechanism, so to speak, that the patient can carry in his pocket. What does it do? When the patient has a block in his heart, the machine, which is attached to the heart through wires, will steady the rhythm of the heart. It will strengthen the rhythm of the heart, and the patient, when going up a flight of steps or otherwise exerting himself more than ordinarily, can regulate the pacemaker so the pacemaker will adjust the heart to take the added strain.

Not only does the pacemaker stimulate the rhythm of the heart, but it also strengthens the heart to the point where oftentimes a patient no longer need use a pacemaker or anything else. His heart becomes strong, the block is removed, and the patient returns to a normal existence, with his heart as it was before he had any block or any trouble with it.

Because of the disease known as otosclerosis of the ear thousands of people are dead. Now doctors can enter the ear through a little hole without cutting from the outside and take out a very small bone known as the stapes and insert a plastic material in lieu of the stapes. Now the person who had lost his hearing due to that disease is able to be alive. Those are the profits from medical research, so far as the financial situation is concerned. People who do medical research have said that we pay thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars into the Federal Treasury through taxes every year.

That is what we are talking about. We are talking about saving lives. We are talking about more production. We are talking about taxes. We are talking about relieving people from human suffering. We are talking about preventing untimely death.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I know the Senator will recall my own interest in this whole field of research, because I have supported the Senator in the past in respect of many items in this area. I recall that not very many years ago I gave a dinner in Washington for a group of Senators, of which the able Senator from Alabama was per-

haps the most distinguished, because of his familiarity with this field. He has often reminded me of that dinner and of some of the things we learned at that time from a very eminent research man in my State and from Dr. Allen Waterman, the head of the National Science Foundation.

I am very much interested in all of the examples of what has been done and the progress that has been made in dealing with these various misfortunes. I would not want to leave the implication in the record that in the budget figures there has been ignored what the Senator is talking about, because the estimates for all this work in the National Institutes of Health total \$583 million.

The point I am talking about is that the bill represents an increase of \$287 million over the 1961 appropriation, and \$252 million over the budget estimates of 1962. That is what we are talking about. While I agree fully with the Senator that we must move ahead with appropriations in this field, and I intend to support them, as I have in the past, I am merely asking the Senator if he does not believe that we ought to pay attention to the requests of the President of the United States because of the situation which we face in the world today. The President and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are not unmindful of the things that the Senator from Alabama has been talking about. They make generous provision for them in the Appropriations for which they have asked.

Mr. HILL. I recall with much pleasure the very delightful occasion when the distinguished Senator from Connecticut was host and I had the privilege and honor of being there as one of the guests. I recall that he had a test tube there that night. I do not believe that it was Dr. Waterman, but one of the distinguished scientists had a test tube filled with fluid which, he said, was enough to blow up the city of Washington.

Every time I see the Senator I query him as to whether or not he has that test tube.

I know that the Senator is interested in this matter. What we want to do is wage this battle according to our capacity to wage it, wage it on a deeper and wider front and more vigorously, and wage it more aggressively.

Let us get on with it. As Dr. Isidor Ravdin said in testimony, if we could go forward and wage this battle against cancer with greater vigor, and more aggressively and on a wider front, we might well get the answer to cancer before some of us think we will be able to get it.

Every 2 minutes during the time that the Senator from Connecticut and I have been talking here this afternoon, a man, woman, or child in these United States has died a tortured and agonized death from cancer. Two people in the United States die every minute from a blood vessel disease. A cardiovascular disease kills more Americans in 6 months time than were killed in the 4 years of World War II.

What we are fighting for is to go forward with these great problems, and

wage these battles more vigorously, more aggressively. It is not a question whether we can afford to wage these battles this way. The question is whether we can afford not to wage them.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I propound the following unanimous-consent request. After discussing the situation with the Senator from Connecticut, the acting minority leader, the Senator from Alabama, and other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that beginning right now, with the amendment now under discussion, 20 minutes of debate be allocated to each amendment of the Senator of Connecticut, 10 minutes under the control of the Senator from Connecticut and 10 minutes under the control of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—is the Senator from Connecticut ready to vote on his first amendment now?

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Let us vote on the amendment now.

Mr. BUSH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, may I inquire what the unanimous-consent request is?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That 20 minutes be allowed on each amendment of the Senator from Connecticut that is proposed, with 10 minutes on each side.

Mr. CARLSON. I had hoped to speak for about 2 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Did I understand that the Senator from Kansas desired to speak for 2 minutes before the vote? If so, I ask unanimous consent that he have that much time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Outside the time allocated on the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Yes. I have one more parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. I understand that the Senate will be ready to vote immediately thereafter upon the pending amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. It is understood that then the time will start to run.

Mr. BUSH. After the vote on the pending amendment the time limitation will start, with 10 minutes allowed to each side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. I did not want to let this debate close without expressing my appreciation again to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

It was my privilege to serve with him in the House of Representatives for many years. It has been my added privilege to serve with him in the Senate. I know of his interest in this great program of the health of our people. It has been my pleasure to have been associated with him in some of these programs, particularly the programs on cancer and heart disease and dental problems and arthritis.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will sustain him on this particular occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL (after having voted in the negative). The junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has asked me to give him a live pair. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." I have already voted "nay"; under the circumstances, I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 123]

YEAS—37

Beall	Ellender	Robertson
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Boggs	Holland	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hruska	Scott
Bush	Javits	Symington
Byrd, Va.	Keating	Talmadge
Capehart	Lausche	Thurmond
Case, N.J.	Long, Mo.	Tower
Case, S. Dak.	Miller	Wiley
Cotton	Morton	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Douglas	Prouty	
Dworshak	Proxmire	

NAYS—50

Aiken	Hartke	Metcalf
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bartlett	Hickey	Morse
Bible	Hill	Moss
Burdick	Humphrey	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Neuberger
Cannon	Johnston	Pastore
Carlson	Jordan	Pell
Carroll	Kefauver	Randolph
Church	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Clark	Long, La.	Smith, Mass.
Dodd	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Ervin	Mansfield	Sparkman
Fong	McCarthy	Stennis
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	McGee	Young, Ohio
Hart	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—13

Allott	Eastland	Kuchel
Butler	Engle	Russell
Chavez	Goldwater	Yarborough
Cooper	Gore	
Dirksen	Kerr	

So Mr. Bush's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, I move that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$80 million," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$54,100,000."

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I shall speak very briefly on this amendment.

On the question of agreeing to this amendment, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Connecticut yield to himself?

Mr. BUSH. I yield myself 5 minutes, although I doubt that I shall use that much time. I understand that 10 minutes are available to each side.

Madam President, this amendment has to do with the item on neurology and blindness activities. It is the last item on the sheet which I believe is on the desk of each Senator, and it is also to be found on page 68 of the report.

The appropriation for 1961 was \$56 million, in round numbers. The budget estimate for 1962 is \$54 million. The House voted \$57 million. The amount recommended by the Senate committee is \$80 million.

Thus, the Senate committee has recommended \$23,500,000 more than the appropriation for 1961, and \$25,900,000 more than the estimate for 1962, and \$22 million more than the amount voted by the House.

I have nothing special to say about this item. It is one of several to which my amendments relate. I merely state that in view of the repeated admonitions by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, it is incumbent upon us to cut back this item to the amount of the President's budget estimate of \$54,100,000.

I reserve the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations whether it is a fact that not one of the very able Republican members of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations opposed the items for the National Health Institutes, as provided by the committee's version of the bill.

Mr. HILL. None who were present at the time when the committee voted on the bill opposed those items.

Mr. MONRONEY. Do I also correctly understand that not one member of the minority party who was present at the time of the action taken by the full committee on the bill voted against the amounts set forth in the committee's version of the bill?

Mr. HILL. There was no yea-and-nay vote, but I heard no "no" vote.

Mr. MONRONEY. What I am pointing out—and I was at both meetings when the vote was taken—is that the members of the committee, who had sat through long days of hearings and were familiar with the program, did not offer amendments to reduce the item when the vote came on the markup of the bill or in full committee.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. What the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has said is correct, but I point out to the distinguished Senator that the Senator from New Hampshire has been associated with this program for many long years, and he has a natural sympathy for the programs which are going on.



As a matter of fact, long before there was any authorization bill by Congress, the Senator from New Hampshire was chairman of the Appropriations Committee in 1947 when it provided the first funds for heart research. The Senator from New Hampshire, together with other Senators, joined in the authorization legislation for a great deal of such programs.

The Senator from New Hampshire, as the ranking Republican member of the committee, did point out that the appropriations have reached a great height from a very humble beginning. The Senator from New Hampshire warned that we have about reached the top level of what we could do in this country at this particular time in this kind of program. In the next fiscal year, we will certainly have to look over the whole program very carefully, but the great work which has been accomplished was as a result of the great humane objective we had sought.

Perhaps, as a result of what the Senator from New Hampshire said, Senators may have refrained from offering amendments. I cannot say as to that. But what the Senator from Oklahoma has said is true. While from the beginning we have sought humane objectives, we have reached the point in appropriations where we must watch these figures next year. If subsequent appropriations start topping those for the fiscal year 1962, we will have to look them over very carefully.

With that explanation, I accept what the Senator from Oklahoma had to say.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has 10 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. BUSH. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. In regard to the comments of the Senator from Oklahoma, so far as I know, a vote in favor of reporting a bill to the floor of the Senate does not preclude any member of the committee of the Senate from voting against it or offering an amendment which will either decrease or increase the amount in the appropriation bill. I had never understood that any vote in the Appropriations Committee, of which I have been a member for 4 years, would imply that no one on the committee who cast such a vote was prevented from voting or proposing any change in the bill as reported by the committee. Certainly, when the question is as to whether the bill shall be reported, a vote in favor does not import or imply that there will not be any difference on it. When an express reservation of right to differ on the floor is declared, there is always the response of the chairman of the committee that that is always the right of any member of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. May I have half a minute more?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. While it is in order for the Senator from Oklahoma to suggest what he has suggested, the other side of the routine and the procedures of the Senate should be made a matter of record here and now, in the light of those remarks.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield, briefly.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska. I had the pleasure of serving with him in the House and later in the Senate. What he has stated is, of course, true. Any Member of either body has a right to offer an amendment, notwithstanding that he voted a certain way in committee; but the fact remains that at the time the committee reported the bill no amendment was offered by a member of the minority to reduce the amount, and many members were strongly in support of the bill as it was reported.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes, briefly. I do not have much time.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not feel committed to support the recommendations of the subcommittee, as a member of the full committee, in view of the fact that there is usually no partisanship display in the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee. It was incredible to me that the 17 Democrat members of the Appropriations Committee would completely disregard, as a group, the recommendations made by their President. So, under the circumstances, I think it would have been futile, within the full committee, to have offered an amendment to cut down the appropriation, just as it is on the floor of the Senate. But some of us think it is just as illogical to appropriate more and more millions of dollars, and hundreds of millions of dollars, at a time when our President and Commander in Chief is making an urgent appeal to provide the sinews of war to defend ourselves against the Soviet threat.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think it should be said that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire was one of the pioneers in the establishment of these health research programs. Before many institutions of that kind had been established, he was fighting for more and more medical research. He certainly was very active in support of such programs when he was chairman of the Appropriations Committee and gave his leadership in fighting for these programs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to remind the Senator from New Hampshire—and he has probably forgotten—that the first institute ever established was almost 23 years ago, the Cancer Institute. I happen to have been the author of it in the House. I think the Senator from New Hampshire was one of the cosponsors here in the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator for that statement. I remember it very well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That was 23 years ago. It was the first one. We had a

problem of getting \$1 million to get it started.

Mr. BRIDGES. I remember, too, that prior to coming to the U.S. Senate, as Governor of my State, we established one of the first cancer research clinics in the United States.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say again that the Senator was one of the real pioneers in this fight for medical research. He not only pioneered it, but through the years he has been one of the strongest and staunchest supporters of medical research.

I shall not detain the Senate except to say that the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, upon which we are about to vote, would slash the funds for research in neurology and blindness.

I may advise the Senate that the witnesses who appeared before our committee, urging that we provide even greater funds than those provided in the bill and which the committee recommended were:

Dr. Houston Merritt, dean of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; director of the Neurological Institute, New York.

Dr. Jules Stein, chairman, Research To Prevent Blindness.

Dr. Martin Palmer, professor of logopedics, University of Wichita; director, Institute of Logopedics, Wichita, Kans.

Dr. Charles A. Kane, professor of neurology; head of the Neurology Department, Boston University, at Boston, Mass.

This Institute is carrying on medical research, trying to find the cause and cure of such diseases as multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, cerebrovascular disease, blindness, mental retardation, muscular dystrophy, and cystic fibrosis.

As we know, the last disease, cystic fibrosis, is today a fatal disease. Only recently, as a result of the program, has it been possible to diagnose it. Now the doctors can diagnose it. We must wage a battle to try to find some way to prevent the disease, or, when it comes, to cure it.

Mr. President, in 1940 there were some 230,000 blind people in the United States. Today there are some 356,000 blind people in the United States. No one knows what caused the blindness of 60 percent of these blind people. Why are the light of day and the light of heaven shut out to them?

The Institute is waging the battle for the blind and for these other people, such as the mentally retarded children and people suffering from many diseases. I urge the rejection of the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senators yield back the remainder of their time, except for perhaps a half minute, for an announcement?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield back my time, except for 1 minute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. BUSH. May I make the announcement now?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, after this vote is taken, I shall offer another amendment which would have the effect of reducing the amount of money in the bill to the Department's estimates to the

Bureau of the Budget. Those estimates call for \$695 million.

The President's budget estimates called for \$583 million, so the Department's estimates are \$112 million in excess of the President's figure.

The Senate bill provides \$835 million for the items involved in my amendment.

Those items are all the items in the NIH column. Sheets are on the desks of Senators. This amendment would eliminate the consideration of the Hospital Construction Act, but includes all the other items in the NIH list.

This will be my final amendment, and it is my understanding a vote will come on the amendment tomorrow, as soon as Senators are ready to vote. The savings involved in the amendment are approximately \$140 million.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, the vote to be taken will be the last vote tonight. Senators should arrange their schedules accordingly.

We shall consider the amendment to which the Senator has made reference, which will be laid before the Senate at the conclusion of this vote, and a vote will be taken on the amendment as soon after the close of morning business tomorrow as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORRON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has been previously announced.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 124]

YEAS—25

Beall	Byrd, Va.	Case, S. Dak.
Bennett	Capehart	Curtis
Bush	Case, N.J.	Douglas

Dworshak  
Hickenlooper  
Holland  
Hruska  
Keating  
Lausche

Miller  
Morton  
Mundt  
Prouty  
Proxmire  
Robertson

Talmadge  
Thurmond  
Tower  
Williams, Del.

NAYS—58

Alken	Hickey	Muskie
Anderson	Hill	Neuberger
Bartlett	Jackson	Pastore
Bible	Javits	Pell
Boggs	Johnston	Randolph
Bridges	Jordan	Saltonstall
Burdick	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Scott
Cannon	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Carlson	Long, La.	Smith, Mass.
Carroll	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Church	Mansfield	Sparkman
Clark	McCarthy	Stennis
Dodd	McClellan	Symington
Ervin	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McNamara	Yarborough
Fulbright	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morse	
Hartke	Moss	

NOT VOTING—17

Allott	Eastland	Humphrey
Butler	Ellender	Kefauver
Chavez	Engle	Kerr
Cooper	Goldwater	Russell
Cotton	Gore	Wiley
Dirksen	Hayden	

So Mr. BUSH's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I offer a series of amendments which I send to the desk. I ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BUSH. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the amendments. The vote on the amendments will not be taken until tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks a table showing the effect of my amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### H.R. 7035. APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Summary of 1961 appropriations, departmental requests for 1962, budget requests and amounts recommended by the House, and by the Senate committee

Activity	Appropriations, 1961	HEW requests to Bureau of Budget	President's budget	House allowance	Senate committee allowance	Senate bill increase over HEW requests
General research.....	\$76,695,000	\$127,638,000	\$95,341,000	\$119,275,000	\$140,000,000	\$12,362,000
National Cancer Institute.....	110,780,000	129,945,000	117,167,000	125,672,000	160,000,000	30,055,000
Mental health.....	100,742,000	99,917,000	88,324,000	92,182,000	125,570,000	25,653,000
Heart Institute.....	86,196,000	116,621,000	97,073,000	105,723,000	160,100,000	43,479,000
Dental Health Institute.....	13,350,300	16,446,000	13,933,000	14,681,000	20,000,000	3,554,000
Arthritis and metabolic diseases.....	60,855,000	82,234,000	68,740,000	73,661,000	90,000,000	7,766,000
Allergy and infectious diseases.....	43,150,000	57,960,000	48,322,000	52,182,000	60,000,000	2,040,000
Neurology and blindness.....	56,409,000	64,303,000	54,100,000	57,624,000	80,000,000	15,697,000
Total.....	558,177,300	695,064,000	583,000,000	641,000,000	835,670,000	140,606,000



Mr. BUSH. In conclusion, the effect of the amendment is to take the Department's own estimates to the Bureau of the Budget, which total \$695 million, and make them the basis of the appropriation. The Senate bill calls for \$835 million on the amendments, and therefore there would be a saving involved of approximately \$140 million.

#### TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPULSION OF COMMUNISTS FROM SPAIN

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement I have made on the 25th anniversary of the Spanish repulsion of Communists from that country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In these ominous and restless days and nights, caused, need I tell you, by the arrogant, heavy-handed, brazen, godless heathens of Moscow I would like to pay tribute and congratulate a great and gallant people and their leader on the 25th anniversary of their repelling and exterminating the communistic, atheistic hordes from within their borders, at a staggering price of a million dead.

I refer to Spain, our historic and traditional friend, and Spain's great leader for nearly a quarter of a century, Gen. Francisco Franco—who is conceded by our own outstanding military men to be one of the finest military scientists and strategists of this or any age.

I have met and talked with General Franco and have no hesitancy in saying he has all the instincts and experience of a statesman; he has rendered a devoted, dedicated, effective and humane service to the Spanish people over the last quarter of a century.

All too often great public figures cannot expect immediate and grateful acknowledgment and appreciation for their services to their countries—they must persevere and persist through abuse, calumny, misrepresentation and lies—as General Franco has done—however the internal satisfaction of a good conscience and knowledge that he was largely responsible through his astute leadership and love of his great country in defeating the barbarous communistic conspiracy, will do him justice even by those at present most prejudiced.

The free world will never adequately be able to repay the Spanish people and General Franco for the tremendous sacrifices in blood, life, and property they made in their civil war—to advance the cause of freedom and Christianity.

I, at this time, would like to extend my warm regards to former Ambassador Josi Felix de Lequerica now chief of the Spanish U.N. mission in New York for the incalculable contribution he made to the present fine relations between our two countries existing while here in Washington.

I would also like to felicitate the present Spanish Ambassador Mariano de Yturralde who is carrying out his assignment in the same high tradition and effective manner as his predecessor Ambassador Lequerica.

#### PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE PRINT ON LEGAL COUNSEL FOR INDIGENT DEFENDANTS IN FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on legal advice for indigent defendants.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I am happy to announce the publication by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of a committee print on the subject of "Legal Counsel for Indigent Defendants in Federal Courts."

The subcommittee study on this subject brings into sharp focus the need of making the right to counsel, as guaranteed by the sixth amendment to our Constitution, a meaningful reality. Recently, I joined as cosponsor of several bills to extend the right to counsel to indigent defendants in all Federal courts throughout our 50 States. Similar legislation was enacted by the 86th Congress with respect to the District of Columbia. I hope that this Congress will act to complete the job.

I am sure you will agree with me, Mr. President, that the right to counsel is a hollow right indeed if it is not to be accompanied with proper safeguards that all accused persons will be provided with adequate counsel, even those who cannot afford to pay for such counsel.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I commend this subcommittee print to your immediate attention.

#### THE PEOPLE SPEAK

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, a report by Samuel Lubell, nationally renowned columnist, gives an insight into the grassroots thinking of people throughout the country. The report proves what I have so often contended, that the American people, given the facts, tend to provide clear answers to the problems facing our Nation.

The fact that the Berlin situation has developed since this poll was taken certainly does not make it any less important. Actually, I believe that it is even more enlightening to get these views of Idahoans, Californians, Virginians, Ohioans, and the rest of the Nation at a time when we are faced with the problem of determining how we can meet our essential defense needs and maintain our fiscal soundness.

I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, Mr. Lubell's column which appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune on July 28.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### INFLATION FEARS ACCENT DOMINANT HOPE—STABILITY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Concluding his probing on where we stand economically today, public opinion reporter Samuel Lubell reveals that fear of more inflation seems to be uppermost in the minds of most Americans.)

(By Samuel Lubell)

In Washington many Government economists talk as if the way to reduce unemployment is through another dose of inflation.

Much of the public, though, feels that inflation has been a major cause of the unemployment we have been having.

Asked what would help make more jobs, 8 of every 10 persons interviewed in recent months oppose wage increases; while 6 of every 10 urge "prices should be cut so people can buy more."

Most of those who say prices should not be reduced explain, "wages would have to

come down, too." Usually they wind up saying, "hold things where they are now."

Price and wage stability is clearly the dominant desire of the overwhelming majority in the country.

On Government spending feelings are more divided.

Much support is voiced for worthwhile projects, such as highways or schools, but not for any general spending program. A sheet-metal worker in Dallas summed up a widely held feeling when he said, "It might help to pump out more money but not to where it pushes up taxes."

Pressure for Government action runs strongest in the major industrial centers like Detroit, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh.

In these areas most workers protest, "Kennedy isn't right when he says the recession is over." But even among these workers there is hardly any support for further boosts in prices or wages.

Talk of Government spending often brings the response, "We've been losing too many factories because taxes are so high already."

This lack of public support for further inflation poses a significant challenge to so-called liberal Keynesian economists. For years many of these economists have argued that a rise of 2 or 3 percent in the price level was not too high a cost to pay for full employment.

But much of the public today is questioning whether full employment is possible if prices are constantly pushed up.

Particularly since the 1958 recession, there has been a marked increase in protests that "we're pricing ourselves out of world markets." The desire to cut down imports has risen to where it is supported by close to a majority of factory workers.

Another common complaint was voiced by a brewery worker in Los Angeles who said, "Every time we get a wage boost the company cuts costs by laying off a few more workers."

Even more widely spread is the feeling that "these big companies are making enough profit so they could cut prices and make it easier to buy things."

Many housewives have told me, "If we need something bad enough we pay these terrible prices but then we have to cut down on everything else."

This has been particularly true where families have saddled themselves with heavy home mortgage payments.

Often these payments upset normal buying habits for years afterward.

In one Detroit suburb a 31-year-old mechanic talked of 4 years of painful adjustment he and his wife have gone through because "back in 1957 I bought a house that was more than I could afford."

To meet the payments he recalled "I stopped drinking beer with my friends. We cut out all movies and entertaining. We let the crab grass grow. My wife went to work. "Our car is 6 years old and we could use a new one," he concluded, "but don't ask me when we'll be able to afford one."

A minor revolt seems also underway against being too deep in debt.

In at least seven different cities housewives or their husbands remarked that "after the 1958 recession we were 2 years paying off all our bills. Since then we buy only what we can pay for."

To sum up, all through the country one finds economic recovery is being held back by the overpricing of the past.

These resistances are warnings of maladjustments that need correcting. They raise one basic question as to the economic policy the country should be following at this time.

Is a fresh inflationary stimulus to economic growth all we need?

Or, would we be wiser to make a hard, detailed examination of the economy to determine three things—(1) what priorities

need to be set to balance foreign and domestic demands, (2) just what are the specific causes of unemployment, and (3) how to regain the lost art of stimulating buying by reducing prices.

#### THE CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the conference report on the Cape Cod National Seashore Park bill represents the culmination of several years of study, meetings, and deliberations during which varying points of view were finally ironed out. We have before us a bill which contributes to the national welfare, in preserving for the enjoyment of all Americans a portion of the rightly famous Cape Cod seashore. The bill at the same time properly safeguards the rights of the homeowners and residents of the area.

The Senate committee report points out that unlike previous national parks, the Cape Cod area is not a wilderness and indeed is not even undeveloped. The establishment of this seashore park marks our recognition that in certain parts of the country we are going to have to set aside outdoor recreation areas even when we do not carve them out of wilderness; the national welfare is now requiring this dedication of land in regions of high population density.

For the enlightenment of all of us who come from areas not familiar with the national park concept, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a portion of the Senate report on S. 857 which describes the special nature of the Cape Cod park, and the special solutions which were written into the bill to take care of these circumstances. In a number of respects we in Michigan are faced with this same set of circumstances in the area surrounding the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area, though Cape Cod is more highly developed than the Michigan regions involved.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 857) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The increasing popularity of Cape Cod is jeopardizing its natural values. The charms of the area are being obliterated by developments. Nevertheless, the National Park Service has found the outer part of Cape Cod to possess not only the last expanse of uninterrupted natural beach of its size in New England but one of the finest ocean shores along the Atlantic coast. Other cape features of outstanding scenic, scientific, and historic interest are found there.

Within this proposed seashore are some 39 miles of beach facing the Atlantic Ocean and 14 miles of beach on Cape Cod Bay and Nantucket Sound. In addition to those beaches, the area would contain about 8 square miles of the spectacular sand dunes, some 20 named fresh-water lakes, and prime examples of the cape's picturesque rolling heathlands, marshes, river valleys, and forests. Important historic sites would also be included. As the first landing place of the Pilgrims in 1620, some of these sites are intimately associated with the most important historical events in the settlement of America.

Recreation has long been the most productive use of the lands still suitable for the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. Low fertility makes them unsuitable for agriculture, and transportation distances,

lack of raw material, and possible depletion of fresh water under extensive use, greatly limit their industrial potential. The economic history of the cape reflects a continuous change from the original broad economic base of fishing and agriculture to specialization in recreation services. Without immediate preservation of the cape's natural features, however, there is great danger that the recreational qualities which have drawn increasing numbers to the cape each year will soon be lost for all time, consumed by commercialization and real estate subdivisions.

In order not to damage the values which the national seashore would preserve, any facilities needed in it would be held to the minimum consistent with public safety, comfort, and enjoyment. No major commercial enterprises within the boundaries are necessary or contemplated. Private enterprise in the adjoining communities would therefore be relied upon to supply meals, lodging, wares, and visitor services. Many such businesses already exist, and it is anticipated that they can be expanded as demand increases.

Development in the seashore would consist primarily of centers where visitors could learn about the area; ranger stations; camping, picnicking, and swimming places with adjacent parking; wayside exhibits, and a system of trails. Roads would be of a type that would permit safe, leisurely enjoyment of the scenery, and portions of the area would be left roadless to preserve their characteristic charm of remoteness.

In planning essential facilities, extreme care would of course be taken to insure that they do not obtrude upon natural and historic features. Structures within the boundaries of the seashore would be designed to blend harmoniously with the natural scene and with the traditional Cape Cod architecture.

The conservation intent of the proposed reservation should not be reduced, but rather enhanced by its recreational capacity. The primary purpose of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore is to preserve henceforth for public enjoyment the scenic, scientific, and historic features that exist here. To the people of Cape Cod, whose livelihood depends upon an economy springing from the cape's natural recreation resources, this means insurance for the future. To the seasonal residents of Cape Cod and to the people of the Nation this means that a source of quiet peace and inspiration, fast disappearing on Cape Cod and elsewhere, will always be available here, becoming more meaningful to each succeeding generation.

A special professional study prepared for the Park Service, analyzing the economic impact of a reservation on the lower cape, found that a national seashore would bring many positive economic effects to the area. It was estimated that during the first few years after the opening of the seashore over \$30 million in capital expenditures on commercial facilities and park facilities would be made. The growth in direct wage payments would be strong, and the establishment of a seashore should result in a material increase in the value of land areas outside the seashore.

Since Cape Cod is not an unsettled wilderness area, but is more heavily settled, enjoys more compact town government, and has a considerably greater degree of development than most previous park areas, it is important that legislation establishing a seashore there meets the legitimate interests of existing residents. Thus S. 857 designates the most exact possible boundaries, includes provisions which afford a method by which the threat of residential property condemnation can be eliminated by local action, and enables the six towns lying within the diagram of the seashore to maintain a sound tax and development base. The bill gives

each residential landowner a minimum guarantee of retaining occupancy up to 25 years. Moreover, in any of the six towns which adopt zoning meeting standards defined by the Secretary of the Interior, the bill assures all homeowners in those towns whose property lines lie within the diagram of the seashore the right to continue to own and occupy their home without interruption or interference so long as the zoning is kept in force.

The bill encourages the Department of the Interior to give the respected and responsible property owners of the lower cape living within the seashore area and their children the most sympathetic consideration and cooperation, enabling them to hold and administer their property as they have in the past, subject to the equitable restrictions which the bill provides and which lie within the administrative authority and judgment of the Secretary.

#### PROPOSED SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on June 27, 1961, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] I introduced a bill proposing to establish in Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area.

From letters which have come to me since that time, I am convinced that many persons would be interested in the language of the bill. This is true particularly of homeowners in this beautiful area of Michigan who fear they will lose their homes and cottages.

Section 4(c) of the bill provides that homeowners in whatever area which is ultimately determined as appropriate for the recreation area would retain their homes indefinitely so long as zoning regulations approved by the Secretary of the Interior are established and maintained by the county.

It is important to emphasize that hasty action will not be taken in this matter. All interested persons will be encouraged to express their views, and public hearings will be held in Michigan. After this, every effort will be made to resolve conflicting viewpoints with due regard for all concerned. This is the responsible way to conduct business which affects many people, and there is no intention of proceeding otherwise.

This area is unique in its beauty, and I believe all of us should endeavor to preserve it.

In order that the general proposal may be before us, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill S. 2153 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the benefit, inspiration, and recreational use of the public a significant portion of the diminishing shoreline of the United States that remains undeveloped, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to take appropriate action, as herein provided, to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area.*

SEC. 2. (a) The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area shall comprise that



particular land and water depicted on the map identified as number NS-SBD-7000, "Proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Seashore", dated June 15, 1961, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior. An exact copy of such map shall be filed for publication in the Federal Register within thirty days following the approval of this Act. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, the land, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon, and any interest therein comprising the area depicted on such map. Any property or interest therein, owned by the State of Michigan, or any political subdivision thereof, may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have authority to incur obligations and enter into contracts involving the expenditure of funds authorized by section 10 of this Act for the acquisition of property and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated.

(c) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within such area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "fair market value" shall be the fair market value as determined by the Secretary who may, in his discretion, base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him.

Sec. 3. As soon as practical after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the recreation area which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

Sec. 4. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of the improved property for non-commercial residential purposes for a term of twenty-five years, or for such lesser time as the said owner or owners may elect at the time of such acquisition. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall have authority to terminate any right of use and occupancy retained as provided in subsection (a) of this section, at any time after the date upon which any use occurs with respect to such property which fails to conform or is in any manner opposed to or inconsis-

ent with the applicable standards contained in regulations issued pursuant to section 5 of this Act and which is in effect on said date: *Provided*, That no use which is in conformity with the provisions of a zoning bylaw approved in accordance with said section 5 and applicable to such property shall be held to fail to conform or be opposed to or inconsistent with any such standard. In the event the Secretary exercises such authority conferred by this subsection, he shall pay to the owner of the right so terminated an amount equal to the fair market value of the portion of said right which remained unexpired on the date of termination.

(c) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within the boundaries of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area for one year following the date of the enactment of this Act. Thereafter such authority shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within such area during all times when the affected counties shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

(d) The term "improved property", wherever used in this Act, shall mean a detached, one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before July 1, 1961, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be at least three acres in area, or all of such lesser acreage as may be held in the same ownership as the dwelling, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining any such beach or waters, as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto.

Sec. 5. (a) As soon after enactment of this Act as may be practicable, the Secretary shall issue regulations specifying standards for approval by him of the zoning bylaws for the purposes of section 4 of this Act. The Secretary may issue amended regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning bylaws whenever he shall consider such amended regulations to be desirable due to changed or unforeseen conditions. The Secretary shall approve any zoning bylaw and any amendment to any approved zoning bylaw submitted to him which conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of adoption by the affected counties of such bylaw or amendment. Such approval shall not be withdrawn or revoked, by issuance of any amended regulations after the date of such approval, for so long as such bylaw or amendment remains in effect as approved.

(b) The standards specified in such regulations and amended regulations for approval of any zoning bylaw or zoning bylaw amendment shall contribute to the effect of (1) prohibiting the commercial and industrial use, other than any commercial or industrial use which is permitted by the Secretary, of all property within the boundaries of the recreation area which is situated within the county adopting such bylaw; and (2) promoting the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the recreation area by means of acreage, front-

age, and setback requirements and other provisions which may be required by such regulations to be included in a zoning bylaw consistent with the laws of the State of Michigan.

(c) No zoning bylaw or amendment of a zoning bylaw shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provision which he may consider adverse to the preservation and the development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the recreation area, or (2) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and any exception made to the application of such bylaw or amendment.

(d) If any improved property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with the provisions of this Act, is made the subject of a variance under or exception to such zoning bylaw or is subjected to any use which variance, exception, or use fails to conform to or is inconsistent with any applicable standard contained in regulations issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of passage of such bylaw, the Secretary may, in his discretion, terminate the suspension of his authority to acquire such improved property by condemnation.

Sec. 6. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same, a certificate indicating, with respect to any property located within the recreation area as to which the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority has been so suspended and the reasons therefor.

Sec. 7. The administration, protection, and development of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 and the following), as amended and supplemented, relating to the areas administered and supervised by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service; except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 8. The Secretary may permit hunting on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the recreation area and under such regulations as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall consult with the appropriate officials of the State of Michigan and any political subdivision thereof which has jurisdiction of hunting prior to the issuance of any such regulations, and the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative arrangements regarding such hunting as he may deem desirable.

Sec. 9. (a) There is hereby established a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area Advisory Commission. Said Commission shall terminate ten years after the date the recreation area is established pursuant to this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of five members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) Two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the counties in which the recreation area is situated, one member to represent each such county;

(2) Two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Michigan; and

(3) One member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area and with respect to the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this Act.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

#### TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

#### RIGHT TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR NURSES OF OREGON—ACT OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, an important milestone in the labor relations history of my State has just been reached. Recently, the Oregon Legislative Assembly passed House bill No. 1360 which provided the right to collective bargaining for the nurses of Oregon. This bill was approved by the Governor of Oregon June 1, 1961.

I have a letter from Miss Shirley M. Thompson, R.N., chairman, Committee on Legislation of the Oregon Nurses Association, Inc., advising me of this fine accomplishment. As she well points out:

This is another pioneering success for Oregon and an historic first in our Nation's history.

As the Senate already knows, I am an advocate of collective bargaining for all employees, whether these employees are employed by private industry, the Government, or charitable organizations. Collective bargaining means an informed work force and a better opportunity for fair working conditions. It has traditionally meant higher take-home pay as well as greater justice in the many decisions which are taken affecting employment conditions. I do not believe that any type of services needed or required by the American people should be subsidized by low wages or unfair working conditions.

For these reasons, I commend my State for the foresight and progress it has made in providing to the nurses of our State the right to bargain collectively and to choose employee representatives for this purpose.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the new law be set forth in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the act was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### HOUSE BILL 1360

An act relating to labor relations involving licensed professional and practical nurses employed in health care facilities

Be it enacted by the people of the State of Oregon:

(NOTE.—Sections 1 through 52 were deleted by amendment. In order to avoid extensive

additional amendments, the other sections were not renumbered.)

SEC. 53. Sufficient competent and dependable care of the ill and infirm is of paramount importance to the general welfare of the people of this State. The legislative assembly recognizes that the public interest requires that effective measures be taken to assure uninterrupted continuation of this care. This State encourages the practice of collective bargaining between employers and employees of health care facilities in both publicly and privately operated health care facilities.

SEC. 54. As used in sections 53 to 62 of this act, unless the context requires otherwise:

1. "Appropriate bargaining unit" means a homogeneous group of employees of a health care facility, having similar interests, duties, preparation and qualifications, determined pursuant to section 57 of this act.

2. "Employee" means a licensed professional or practical nurse performing services for compensation for a health care facility, but does not include a member of a religious order assigned to a health care facility by the order as a part of his obligations to the order.

3. "Health care facility" means a hospital or nursing home, agency or establishment, whether operated publicly or privately, having as one of its principal purposes the preservation of health or the care of sick or infirm individuals, or both. However, "health care facility" does not include a facility in which terms of employment are governed by the State civil service law or any other system of civil service operated under statute or ordinance, nor a facility employing fewer than four employees.

4. "Labor commissioner" means the commissioner of the bureau of labor.

SEC. 55. It is an unfair labor practice for an employee or representative of an employee to encourage, participate in or cause a strike or work stoppage against or directly involving a health care facility.

SEC. 56. It is an unfair employment practice for a health care facility to do one or more of the following acts:

1. Interfere with, restrain or coerce employees in any manner in the exercise of their right of self-organization.

2. Initiate, create, dominate, contribute to or interfere with the formation or administration of an employee organization that has collective bargaining as one of its principal functions.

3. Discriminate in regard to hire, terms or conditions of employment in order to discourage membership in an employee organization that has collective bargaining as one of its principal functions.

4. Refuse to meet and bargain in good faith with the duly designated representatives of an appropriate bargaining unit of its employees. For the purposes of this subsection, it is a requirement of bargaining in good faith that the parties be willing to reduce to writing, and have their representatives sign, any agreement arrived at through negotiation and discussion.

5. Institute, cause or declare a lockout.

SEC. 57. (1) The composition in a health care facility of an appropriate bargaining unit may, for the purposes of sections 53 to 62 of this act, be determined by common consent between the person or authority in charge of the facility and the employees thereof. If either party applies to the labor commissioner, the commissioner or his representative shall make the determination of the composition of the appropriate bargaining unit.

(2) In determining an appropriate bargaining unit under subsection (1) of this section, professional employees may not be included in the same bargaining unit with nonprofessional employees, unless the labor commissioner finds that a majority of the professional employees of that bargaining unit desire inclusion within such bargaining unit.

SEC. 58. An employee organization is considered to be the duly designated representative of all the employees in an appropriate bargaining unit for the purposes of section 56 of this act if it can show evidence that the bargaining rights have been assigned to it by a majority of the employees in that bargaining unit.

SEC. 59. (1) If the right of an employee organization to represent the employees in a bargaining unit is questioned by the authority in charge of the facility employing the employees, the employee organization may petition the labor commissioner for a determination. The labor commissioner or his representative shall investigate and determine the composition of an appropriate bargaining unit, if such determination has not previously been made under section 57 of this act, and shall determine the representative, if any, designated to represent the employees in that bargaining unit.

(2) An employee organization found by the labor commissioner to be authorized by at least 30 percent of the employees in an appropriate bargaining unit may apply for an election by secret ballot to determine its right to represent the employees in that bargaining unit.

If more than one employee organization claims to represent employees in the bargaining unit, the labor commissioner or his representative may conduct an election by secret ballot to determine which is authorized to represent the unit. If an employee organization receives a majority of the valid votes cast at the election, it is considered to be authorized to represent all the employees in that bargaining unit for the purposes of section 56 of this act.

(3) A determination under this section remains in effect for at least 1 year.

SEC. 60. The labor commissioner, a health care facility or any employee organization qualified to apply for an election under section 56 of this act may, in its name or in the name of its members, institute proceedings to restrain the commission of an unfair employment or labor practice listed in section 55 or 56 of this act. The proceeding may be instituted in the circuit court for any county in which the health care facility does business. The court in such an action may grant mandatory or prohibitory relief.

SEC. 61. If a health care facility and the representative of an appropriate bargaining unit of its employees are unable to reach agreement after protracted collective bargaining in good faith, either party may:

(1) Request the State conciliation service to mediate the dispute. Both parties shall participate actively and in good faith in the mediation of such dispute by the labor conciliator.

(2) Apply to the labor commissioner for a factfinding inquiry concerning the dispute, if the parties are not able to settle their dispute within 10 days through mediation and conciliation. Upon such an application, the labor commissioner shall forthwith make an investigation of the dispute. The labor commissioner may, in compliance with ORS 183.310 to 183.510, hold hearings, issue subpoenas, administer oaths and do all things necessary to enable him to make a complete investigation. Upon completion of his investigation the labor commissioner shall make written findings of fact and file the original thereof as a part of the record of his investigation. He shall serve a copy of the findings upon each of the parties.

SEC. 62. In compliance with ORS 183.310 to 183.510, the labor commissioner may promulgate rules and regulations not inconsistent with sections 53 to 62 of this act that are necessary to enable him to carry out sections 53 to 62 of this act.

Approved, June 1, 1961.



**AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 654)**

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1703) to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], a member of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

**ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED**

The following additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2362. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive entitlement to benefits thereunder for one or more consecutive months; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 2363. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2364. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell landowners in urban areas the rights of the United States to certain minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

**AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO WAIVER OF ENTITLEMENT TO BENEFITS**

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive entitlement to benefits thereunder for one or more consecutive months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2362) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive entitlement to benefits thereunder for one or more consecutive months, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the bill which I now introduce will permit an individual who is receiving monthly social security benefits to waive entitlement of all or any part of such benefits for one or more consecutive months by filing a waiver certificate. Recipients of benefits under the railroad retirement

and civil service retirement systems already have this privilege under existing law.

The primary purpose of my bill is to give relief to widows who, because of the increased social security benefit provided in the 1961 social security amendments—Public Law 87-64—may suffer a reduction in the amount of widow's pension payable by the Veterans' Administration. Under this law the benefit formula for the widow was increased from 75 to 82½ percent of her husband's primary benefit amount.

The reason for this inequitable situation is that under the sliding scale pension plan for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities and for their widows the income range determines the amount of pension payable. A widow whose income does not exceed \$600 receives a monthly pension of \$60. If her income range is between \$600 and \$1,200 she receives a monthly pension of \$45. If her income range is \$1,200 to \$1,800 her monthly benefit is only \$25. If her income exceeds \$1,800 her pension is discontinued.

The case called to my attention was that of a widow who was receiving \$75 monthly survivor benefit under the social security program and about \$25 of income from private sources, plus the widow's pension from the Veterans' Administration. The \$7.50 increase in her social security benefit brings her total annual income above the \$1,200 limitation, thereby reducing her veterans widow's pension from \$45 to \$25 so that she will actually receive \$12.50 a month less in total income rather than \$7.50 more as provided in Public Law 87-64.

The bill I introduce will correct this inequity and carry out the intent of the Congress.

**TRADE PROMOTION THROUGH FOREIGN EXHIBITS IN THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENTS**

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 1729, the Foreign Commerce Act of 1961, to provide for the use of foreign currencies held by the United States to help finance the costs incurred outside this country by foreign exhibitors who wish to participate in trade and industrial fairs and other expositions within the United States. Hearings have been held by the Commerce Committee on S. 1729 and I hope that this amendment may be made a part of the bill as it is reported by this committee.

The primary purpose of the amendment is to further trade expansion and act as a direct stimulant for U.S. exports. Three important requirements for the increase of U.S. exports are:

First. The opportunity of U.S. businessmen to see what others are producing so that we can compete with these products in foreign markets.

Second. The exchange of trade and technical information on what is demanded in foreign markets and on channels of trade.

Third. The ability of foreign producers to sell their goods to earn dollars in the United States.

For the developing nations of the free world—potential markets for our exports likely to show the greatest relative improvement factor—the third point is of special importance. They now suffer from severe dollar shortages, and if the United States is to get a foothold in their markets they have to enjoy some exports to us, too, above bare raw materials supplies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my amendment and an explanatory note inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and appropriately filed; and, without objection, the amendment and note will be printed in the Record.

The amendment, submitted by Mr. JAVITS, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 6, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"(12) in consultation and cooperation with the Secretary of State, to finance, exclusively through the use of foreign currencies acquired under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 in such amounts as may be made available pursuant to section 104(s) of such Act, costs incurred outside the United States for participation in trade, industrial, agricultural, horticultural, and scientific fairs, expositions, and exhibits in the United States by foreign nations and other foreign exhibitors;"

On page 6, line 12, strike out "(12)" and insert in lieu thereof "(13)".

On page 6, line 24, strike out "(13)" and insert in lieu thereof "(14)".

The explanatory note presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

1. This amendment adds another function to the Commerce Department activities authorized in S. 1729. However, it specifies that only U.S.-owned foreign currencies may be used in carrying out this function—there is no such limitation on the other functions authorized in S. 1729.

2. Consultation and cooperation with the Secretary of State is specified in order to make clear the primacy of the Department of State in overseas activities.

3. Section 104(s) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act to which this amendment refers is provided for by title V of S. 1729.

4. The language in the amendment, "in such amounts as may be made available," is intended to make clear that the funds authorized are subject to appropriation by the Congress.

**DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962—AMENDMENTS**

Mr. BUSH submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, August 2, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 1, 1961:

#### U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Jonathan W. Daniels, of North Carolina, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for the term expiring January 27, 1964, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 1, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

St. John's tribute to Jesus in the prolog of his gospel: John 1:4: *In Him was life; and the life was the light of men.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, we worship and adore Thee whose presence is our shield in the stillness of the night and our strength in the struggles of each new day.

May we now feel, in some special sense that, in this moment of prayer, this Chamber may be for all of us a place of vision and of inspiration.

Bless us with fervor and fidelity as we continue to pray and labor for the coming of that time when heavy-burdened and heartbroken humanity shall be emancipated from the godless and evil forces of aggression and aggrandizement.

Bestow upon our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of Congress the unction of Thy holy spirit, enabling them to mediate light and hope to a world groping in darkness.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7445. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of

the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KERR, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF THIS WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week, if he can give us such information at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Today the airport bill will be brought up extending the Federal Airport Act.

Tomorrow, if the Committee on Rules reports out a rule on the bill S. 2311, which is the same as the bill H.R. 8353, which I have listed on the program heretofore, that bill will be the first order of business. I have been informed and I want to advise the Members to expect a rollover on that bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman know whether or not a rule has been reported on that bill? I see the chairman of the committee is here.

Mr. VINSON. I appeared before the Committee on Rules this morning, and I have every assurance that a rule will be filed so that the bill may be in order to be considered tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. How much time will be allowed for general debate?

Mr. VINSON. A rule has been granted. There will be 2 hours of general debate, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and one-half by myself. It is an open rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thereafter we will take up H.R. 30, which is on the program. That is the New England compact bill.

As to Thursday, after a conference yesterday with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, your conference was with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], the leader of our party.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said, after a talk with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, sitting outside of the Chamber here, as the three of us were, they very kindly discussed the reorganization plan with me so that I could advise the Members of the House when it would be called up. The gentleman from Iowa has assured me that he

would call up plan No. 6 and, therefore, after our talk I set that down for Thursday next.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman, as far as our side is concerned, without undertaking to speak for all of the Members on our side, of course, we had considerable discussion about plan No. 6 and found that many Members on our side are not in disagreement with the plan.

Mr. McCORMACK. I doubt if the debate will be long from information I have received—if there is any debate at all. But, after reorganization plan No. 6, then if the Committee on Rules reports out rules tomorrow on two bills that have been reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, H.R. 7856, relating to certain reorganization aspects in relation to the Federal Communications Commission, and the other bill, H.R. 8033, ICC Act, orders of hearing officers, as I say, those two bills will be programed for Thursday also, of course, with the expectation that we will dispose of the legislative business of this week by Thursday, and I am confident that the House will cooperate to that end.

Mr. HALLECK. Were both of the bills reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. McCORMACK. They have been reported and the Committee on Rules is giving a hearing on both of them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the calling up of Reorganization Plan No. 6 is conditional upon whether the distinguished Speaker will recognize a Member for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. That is always a question that has to be answered.

### APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUNDRY INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, CORPORATIONS, AGENCIES, AND OFFICES, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and, of course, I will not object, the other body has adopted an amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill and, in addition, has reduced appropriations from \$390,000 to \$90,000 which would prevent the General Services Administration from acting for the Government before Federal and State regulatory